

Jürg Egger

Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14

The Research History from the End
of the 19th Century to the Present

University Press Fribourg Switzerland
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Eggler, Jürg:

Influences and traditions underlying the vision of Daniel 7:2-14: the research history from the end of the 19th century to the present / Jürg Eggler. – Fribourg, Switzerland: Univ. Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000.

(Orbis biblicus et orientalis; 177)

ISBN 3-7278-1320-2

ISBN 3-525-53991-6

Veröffentlicht mit Unterstützung des Hochschulrats
und des Rektorates der Universität Freiburg Schweiz

Camera-ready text
submitted by the author

© 2000 by University Press Fribourg Switzerland / Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen

Herstellung: Paulusdruckerei Freiburg Schweiz
ISBN 3-7278-1320-0 (University Press)
ISBN 3-525-53991-6 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht)

Digitalisat erstellt durch Florina Tischhauser,
Religionswissenschaftliches Seminar, Universität Zürich

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THE MOTIFS OF THE SEA, THE FOUR WINDS, AND THE FOUR BEASTS (VERSES 2–8)	3
2.1. BABYLONIAN INFLUENCE	3
2.2. GREEK INFLUENCE	8
2.3. CANAANITE INFLUENCE	9
2.4. ASTROLOGICAL INFLUENCE	15
2.5. PHOENICIAN INFLUENCE	18
2.6. IRANIAN INFLUENCE	18
2.7. EGYPTIAN INFLUENCE	19
2.8. TREATY CURSE IMAGERY INFLUENCE	19
2.9. BIRTH OMEN INFLUENCE	20
2.10. VISION OF THE NETHERWORLD	23
2.11. ‘KOSHER MENTALITY’ INFLUENCE	27
2.12. OLD TESTAMENT INFLUENCE	28
2.12.1. <i>The different uses of Old Testament passages</i>	28
2.12.2. <i>The most cited Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:2–8</i>	35
2.13. ICONOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE	42
2.13.1. <i>Lion</i>	42
2.13.2. <i>Bear</i>	45
2.13.3. <i>Leopard</i>	47
2.13.4. <i>Fourth Beast</i>	48
3. THE MOTIFS OF THE JUDGEMENT SCENE, THE “ANCIENT OF DAYS”, AND THE “SON OF MAN” (VERSES 9–14)	55
3.1. BABYLONIAN INFLUENCE	55
3.2. CANAANITE INFLUENCE	58
3.3. IRANIAN INFLUENCE	71
3.4. INDIAN INFLUENCE	77
3.5. ASTROLOGICAL INFLUENCE	78
3.6. GREEK INFLUENCE	79
3.7. EGYPTIAN INFLUENCE	79
3.8. TYRIAN INFLUENCE	80
3.9. SYRO–PALESTINIAN INFLUENCE	81
3.10. VISION OF THE NETHERWORLD	84
3.11. OLD TESTAMENT INFLUENCE	87
3.11.1. <i>Traditio–historical explanations of the “son of man”</i>	88
3.11.1.1. <i>Messiah</i>	88
3.11.1.2. <i>Angelic being</i>	90
3.11.1.3. <i>The people of Israel</i>	92
3.11.1.4. <i>The glory of Yahweh</i>	93
3.11.1.5. <i>Adam</i>	94

3.11.2. <i>Structural traditio–historical explanations of Dan 7:9–14</i>	95
3.11.2.1. The Israelite enthronement festival	95
3.11.2.2. Psalm 89	96
3.11.2.3. Zion–David/four–empire/enemy–of–God traditions	97
3.11.2.4. Ezekiel	98
3.11.3. <i>The most cited Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:9–14</i>	102
3.12. ICONOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE	107
3.12.1. <i>The outward appearance of the “Ancient of days”</i>	107
3.12.2. <i>The “Ancient of days” enthroned</i>	108
3.12.3. <i>The throne of the “Ancient of days”</i>	108
3.12.4. <i>The audience of the enthroned “Ancient of days”</i>	109
3.12.5. <i>The outward appearance of the “son of man”</i>	109
3.12.6. <i>The “son of man” coming with clouds</i>	109
3.12.7. <i>The investiture of the “son of man”</i>	110
ABBREVIATIONS	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115
INDEX OF AUTHORS	131
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	135
INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES	141

Acknowledgements

This study has been realised with the support and assistance of many persons and institutions. The *Erziehungs- und Kulturdirektion Kanton Basel-Landschaft*, Switzerland, provided financial support for my studies from the B.A., B.A. Honours, M.A. to the doctoral studies. The same is true for my parents, Johannes and Emmy Egger.

My promoter, Prof. Izak Cornelius of Stellenbosch University, South Africa, assisted with ongoing support and constructive criticism.

The following persons supplied me with important bibliographic information and other data: Prof. Atilio Dupertuis (Andrews University, USA), Prof. Izak Cornelius (Stellenbosch University, South Africa), Yvonne Gerber (Universität Basel, Switzerland), Dr. Thomas Domanyi (Vermes, Switzerland), and Hannes Kovar (Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen, Austria).

I would like to thank Alice Cronje and Rosalie Stockil for improving the English text. All remaining mistakes are mine.

I would also like to thank Prof. Othmar Keel for his generosity in accepting this research history for the publication in the *OBO* series.

Without the proper *Umfeld* I would never have been able to put into this study the needed effort. I would like to thank my wife, Ute, for her support in caring for our two daughters, Salome and Livia, and in taking many loads from my shoulders so that I was free to concentrate on my studies.

1. Introduction

The following research history on the influences and traditions underlying the vision of Dan 7¹ represents the first chapter of my doctoral dissertation *Iconographic Motifs from Palestine/Israel and Daniel 7:2–14* submitted at the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa, in 1998.²

Available research histories on the tradition–history of the vision of Dan 7 are often more or less detailed treatments of either the first part (Dan 7:2–8) or the second part (Dan 7:9–14) of the vision. In the second part the whole issue is usually reduced to a single topic, i.e., the “son of man”. Traditio–historical reviews on the whole vision are scant and very often only a few pages, barely outlining the parameters of the whole debate. It is hoped that the following research history will be a step towards filling this void.³

Apart from informing about the current state of research on the tradition–history of Dan 7, the present research history also provides a good example for studying the mechanics of the traditio–historical comparative method and of the difficulty of establishing a uniform measure as to what constitutes a parallel and to what degree.

Since the doctoral dissertation was in nature an iconographic study the chapter on the research history did not attempt to engage in the discussion which of the many suggested influences are to be considered as ultimately formative for the present text of the vision of Dan 7. The following research history demonstrates that the background of the Danielic vision is complex and defies a simplistic explanation. In addition to the presented traditions and influences as seen by the various authors, the reader is aided in forming his or her own judgement by means of critical scholarly remarks to the various proposals placed in summary form in the last footnote of the particular background.

The chronological starting point for the following research history is H. GUNKEL’S suggested Babylonian background which launched the traditio–historical explanations of the vision of Dan 7 with all its vigour in 1895. The structure of the research history has been adapted to the particularly complex and heterogeneous nature of the proposed backgrounds of the vision. Thus, since many traditio–historical studies often emphasise only one part of the vision, the research history is divided into the commonly–accepted two parts of the vision. Another

¹ The term “Dan 7” stands throughout this study for the *vision* of Dan 7, i.e., Dan 7:2–14, respectively in the first part of this history of research for Dan 7:2–8 and in the second part for Dan 7:9–14.

² Apart from a number of minor changes and the inclusion of a few additional references the present version is substantially identical to the original submitted research history.

³ In the context of the submitted doctoral dissertation the research history served two purposes apart from giving an overview on the results of the research on this particular aspect of the vision of Dan 7. First, it aimed to make the reader aware of the numerous proposed influences, the intricate tradition–history, and the multifaceted nature of the suggested background of Dan 7. Secondly, it served to ensure an objective as possible perspective on the relevance of iconographic influences on the vision of Dan 7, thereby cautioning against making visual art another all–explaining influence.

feature of many treatments is that different origins for particular parts of the vision were proposed by a single author. Therefore each part of the vision was subdivided into the various suggested backgrounds. Thus it is a frequent feature that the work or views of one scholar appears in different subsections. In regard to the order within each of the two main sections, it must be pointed out that the first three backgrounds mentioned are the most important extra-biblical explanations of each part (excluding the Greek influence in the first section).⁴ They are followed in chronological order by the remaining extra-biblical proposals. Both sections are concluded by suggested Old Testament and iconographic influences.

The research of the background to the vision of Dan 7 has often been more than just an academic exercise. It cannot be overlooked that on occasion a heated ideological struggle charged the atmosphere. Therefore the present research history not only presents results but also opens the window to this other side of the academic debate. Footnotes will sometimes contain substantive quotations in the original language to elucidate underlying concepts and present critical scholarly responses more accurately in order to highlight the impact certain ideas have had. Bare summaries comprising only facts would omit a major portion that was part and parcel of the various results forthcoming from the last 100 years of research.

⁴ For historical reasons in regard to the research history the Greek influence was placed there, not because of the impact it had.

2. The motifs of the sea, the four winds, and the four beasts (verses 2–8)

2.1. Babylonian influence

The first scholar to propose a Babylonian-related background to Dan 7 was H. GUNKEL in his religio-historical investigation *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* published in 1895. Several unexplained elements⁵ in the vision of Dan 7 led GUNKEL to the conclusion that this vision was not created by the author himself – otherwise he would have given interpretative hints for these unexplained features – but that the author had adopted and allegorised pre-existing material (1895: 327f).

GUNKEL's methodological starting point and basis for his religio-historical analysis of the vision of Dan 7 was a comparison of the Danielic motif of beasts coming up from the sea symbolising kingdoms hostile to God with similar imagery in other Old Testament and apocryphal passages.⁶ These comparative passages represent – according to GUNKEL⁷ – an adaptation of the Babylonian creation myth *Enuma Elish*, namely, a version that functioned as *prophecy* and was *directed against the political enemy*.⁸ Since GUNKEL believed he had encountered in Dan 7 the same eschatologically-coloured version of the Babylonian creation myth as in his adduced group of comparative passages, he argued that the Danielic vision had to be interpreted in the light of this comparative material.⁹

⁵ Such elements were according to GUNKEL (1895: 327f): (1) Why do the beasts come out of the sea while only the Greek-Macedonian empire came from the sea? (2) What is the purpose of the four winds that stir up the sea? (3) What does it mean that the first beast assumes a human posture and mind? (4) Why are kingdoms depicted as animals? (5) How can it be explained that the fourth kingdom does not correspond to a specific animal? (6) Why is the strange image of “one like a ‘son of man’ coming in the clouds of heaven” used to illustrate God’s people? (7) The figure 3 ½ which is not explained by the context.

⁶ Isa 30:7; Eze 29; 32; Psa 68:31; 87:4; Isa 27:1; Psa 74; Ps Sol 2.

⁷ It should be noted that it was not GUNKEL who first drew attention to poetic Old Testament passages as reflections of the *Enuma Elish*. Such a connection was already proposed by T.K. CHEYNE in 1877. Furthermore, GUNKEL has been accused of outright plagiarism by not giving credit to G.A. BARTON who already in 1893 published an article which cited the main passages about Rahab and Leviathan as reflections of the *Enuma Elish* – an article that was used by GUNKEL in the preparation of his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (LAMBERT 1965: 287f).

⁸ “Nun ist oben gezeigt worden, dass diese Stücke [cf. the passages mentioned above in n. 6] den babylonischen Chaosmythus enthalten, der eine Weissagung geworden war und herkömmlich auf einen politischen Feind gedeutet wurde” (GUNKEL 1895: 328).

⁹ For additional support of his thesis, GUNKEL (ibid. 328–333) cited the following list of elements found in Dan 7 which correspond with the remaining recensions of the *Enuma Elish* as he had found them in various Old Testament and apocryphal passages: (1) the term “beast” is used; (2) the beasts come out of “the great sea”; (3) the beasts “ascend” from the sea; (4) the winds stir up the sea before the beasts come out of it; (5) although

Thus GUNKEL did not simply compare the *Enuma Elish* myth with Dan 7.¹⁰ Rather, he compared Old Testament and apocryphal parallels which, according to GUNKEL, exhibited elements of *adapted chaos myth traditions* and added Dan 7 to this list. It is evident that GUNKEL did not view the *Enuma Elish* myth as we know it as the direct source of Dan 7. What the author of Dan 7 used, according to GUNKEL, was an *adapted* version of the *Enuma Elish*, which was believed to be an ancient tradition revealed by God to one of his prophets of old.¹¹

GUNKEL'S position was soon adopted by a number of scholars, such as D.K. MARTI (1901: 48),¹² H. ZIMMERN (SCHRADER/ZIMMERN/WINCKLER 1903: 508, 513), and G. HÖLSCHER (1919: 126, 129), without adding any new arguments.

The first significant deviation from GUNKEL'S original thesis was proposed by E. MEYER. He advanced the view that the core of Dan 7 reflects a *four-beast*

the beasts belong to the sea, their dominion is also on the land; (6) the beasts are enemies of man and God; (7) the stamping with the feet; (8) the blaspheming of God; (9) the war against the holy ones and their defeat; (10) God remembers his people and will establish his kingdom after the victory over the enemy. Elements that had no clear literary parallels were understood by GUNKEL not as the work of the author of Dan 7 but were explained as a reflection of a different version of the Babylonian creation myth. He mentioned the following features: (1) the figure 3 ½; (2) the burning of the fourth beast with fire; (3) the "son of man"; (4) the description of the throne of the "Ancient of days"; (5) the plucking of three horns; (6) the ten horns; (7) a *single* chaos beast, exhibiting the aspects of a lion, eagle, bear, and leopard (ibid. 330–333).

¹⁰ A basic feature of GUNKEL'S approach is his notion that the author of Dan 7 operated with a *variation* of the *Enuma Elish* myth. GUNKEL was well aware that the parallels to the *Enuma Elish* in its traditional form were not necessarily convincing when studied in detail. Therefore he had to postulate a different origin, i.e., non-extant adapted versions of the *Enuma Elish* myth, which are reflected in various Old Testament and apocryphal passages.

¹¹ Therefore GUNKEL questioned that the author of Dan had known the "original" *Enuma Elish*: "Er [the author of Dan 7] hat nicht als der Erste den Chaos-Mythus als Weissagung gefasst; vielmehr waren ihm darin schon viele Geschlechter vorangegangen. Der Verfasser hat den Mythus in dieser Form bereits überkommen; und es ist durchaus nicht selbstverständlich, dass er seinen ursprünglichen Sinn noch gekannt habe [my emphasis]. Eine uralte Weissagung [i.e., a prophecy-against-the-political-enemy variant of the *Enuma Elish*] cursierte (*sic*) damals: es werde einst am Ende der Tage eine schreckliche Zeit kommen, wo die Mächte der Finsternis auf Erden herrschen, Gottes Volk bedrängen und schrecklich gegen den Höchsten freveln; aber auf diese Tage des Zorns werde nach Gottes Rat die Zeit kommen, wo 'der Menschensohn', auf den Wolken des Himmels kommend das Regiment ergreift ... Diese Beobachtungen sind wichtig für eine gerechte Beurteilung des Apokalyptikers. Der Verfasser des Daniel hat diese Weissagung nicht ex eventu erfunden und seine willkürliche Erdichtung frischweg dem alten Propheten in den Mund gelegt – wie hätte er dann selbst daran glauben können? –, sondern er hat sie aus der Tradition übernommen, und er hat dabei den ganz richtigen Eindruck gehabt, dass die Überlieferung uralte sei: einem Propheten der alten Zeit muss sie von Gott offenbart sein" (ibid. 334).

¹² MARTI (1901: 49) did not only have the Babylonian mythological cosmogony in mind when he traced the background of Dan 7 but also some Western Asian influence. Thus he compared the expression "the four winds of heaven" with the Phoenician *wind kolphia* "father of the world" (רוח כל פאה) "wind from every side").

Babylonian¹³ myth rather than a *one-beast*¹⁴ myth such as the *Enuma Elish* (1921: 197 with n. 2). This Babylonian four-beast myth originated from an even older myth of the battles of the gods (ibid. 195).¹⁵ However, a serious weakness of this thesis was acknowledged by MEYER himself, namely, that such a myth was unknown (ibid. 197).

Additional criticism of GUNKEL's link between Dan 7 and the *Enuma Elish* was voiced by W. BAUMGARTNER. In his Daniel commentary published in 1926 he rejected any such link and suggested another Babylonian myth as the background of Dan 7, namely, the myth of Bel and Labbu. However, he finally considered this background inconclusive as well since the myth of Bel and Labbu mentions only one beast. Nevertheless, BAUMGARTNER argued that the apocalypticist used "diese alten Mythenstoffe" (1926: 24), since they contained the mood which was important for his composition.

While C.H. KRAELING (1927: 145) followed GUNKEL without reservation, renewed doubt about a pan-Babylonian background of Dan 7 is discernible in the 1930s. Thus, although E.G.H. KRAELING basically agreed with GUNKEL's thesis, he elaborated as MEYER had done on the splitting up of one beast into four, which he explained was "due to the influence of the Iranian theory of four ages of history as held by Daniel" (1933: 228).¹⁶

Furthermore, the recently-available Ugaritic texts from Ras Shamra constituted another element that contributed to the weakening of a Babylonian background to Dan 7. Thus, although A. BENTZEN's (1937: 31–33) position shows a tendency to endorse a Babylonian background in regard to the sea¹⁷ and the four beasts, he favoured a distinctly Canaanite influence for the fourth beast (cf. p. 10). Furthermore, BENTZEN described the four winds as cosmogonic symbols of doom in

¹³ MEYER (1921: 197) seemed in addition to assume some Hittite and Persian influence since he remarked: "Dass der Mythos von den vier Tieren fremden Ursprungs ist, bedarf keiner Ausführung. Ihre Gestalt entspricht den phantastischen Mischwesen, welche die babylonische wie die chetitische Mythologie geschaffen und die Kunst in unzähligen Variationen dargestellt hat, und als die auch die persischen Skulpturen die Dämonen bilden."

¹⁴ However, by the time MEYER had advanced his views GUNKEL himself had already given up the one-beast theory and also assumed an underlying myth with four beasts (GUNKEL 1910: 81 with n. 3). Contra a four-beast-myth cf. BAUMGARTNER 1939: 219 and p. 6 below as well as GESE 1983: 378. A late supporter of MEYER's four-beast myth is BENTZEN 1952: 59; cf. also below n. 35 on p. 10.

¹⁵ According to this myth, which MEYER did not identify with the *Enuma Elish*, the sea harboured the most terrible monsters. When at the end of the world all elements will be loose and when all four winds together come down unto the world sea and stir up its deepest deep, four monsters will ascend unto the earth, one more terrible than the other in order to destroy the earth, until they will die in the final judgement (1921: 197).

¹⁶ Recently REID (1989: 84, 90) argued along the same lines (cf. p. 19).

¹⁷ It is not entirely clear if BENTZEN directly referred to a Babylonian background in regard of the sea, since he used the term "creation story" when he stated: "Das grosse Meer ... ist wohl sicher das Chaosmeer der Schöpfungsgeschichte" (1937: 31) which would indicate Gen 1 but at the same time he also added a reference to VOLZ 1934: 280 which speaks of the creation myth, i.e., the *Enuma Elish*, and in the second edition he supplemented it with a reference to KAPELRUD 1952: 102ff which refers to the Ugaritic chaos sea.

only very general terms and in his discussion of the four beasts he placed greater emphasis on the symbolic nature of the beasts, i.e., their appearance as symbols of the general ancient Near Eastern *Weltvorstellung* rather than their link to a specific myth (cf. also pp. 44, 46, 48).

In a similar fashion BAUMGARTNER's review of 25 years of research of the Book of Daniel exhibits a very high degree of ambiguity and ambivalence with no clear preference for any position. He seemed to endorse a general Babylonian mythological background as proposed by GUNKEL in 1895. His opposition against the *Enuma Elish* myth as the ultimate source for the background of Dan 7, as verbalised in his commentary on Daniel in 1926, is still detectable. BAUMGARTNER was more inclined to follow MEYER's theory of a four-beast myth than to subscribe to the *Enuma Elish* tradition as the sole source of Dan 7 (1939: 218). In the course of his discussion BAUMGARTNER (ibid. 218f) however questioned any link to a specific Babylonian myth. In this he followed H. JUNKER (1932: 36–38)¹⁸ who held that the beasts of Dan 7 are not of mythological origin but only the most terrible beasts known in Israel being described in typical ancient Near Eastern mythological fashion. This led BAUMGARTNER to reject MEYER's four-beast theory – a position he favoured above GUNKEL's original one-beast theory – only to conclude the whole discussion with a pro-mythological, pro-GUNKEL statement: "... man fühlt sich viel eher versucht, mit Hölscher ... auf Gunkels erste Deutung [i.e., one chaos-beast was split up into four in order to fit the four kingdoms] zurückzugreifen" (1939: 219).

A renewed forceful case for a Babylonian background was made by E.W. HEATON who compared the Danielic four winds of the heaven that "brake forth upon the great sea" with "the god Marduk [who] stationed the four winds and then advanced to slay Tiamat, a female dragon and her brood, in order to create an ordered universe" (1956: 175). Furthermore, he argued that the Hebrew word *tehom*, used in Gen. 1:2 is "philologically the same as *Tiamat*" and that "both are used as proper names without definite article" (ibid.).¹⁹ In addition HEATON quoted G.R. DRIVER (1926: 142) who stated that "among Tiamat's brood were great lions, raging serpents and vipers" and that "a frequent motif in Babylonian art is the contest between the god of creation and diverse monsters."

For A. JEFFERY (1956: 452), writing in the *Interpreter's Bible* commentary, the four winds of heaven resembled the four winds of the creation epic, and the great sea was understood as the "circumambient ocean" which is found in Sumerian and Babylonian mythology as well as Old Testament passages such as Gen 1:2; 7:11; Amo 7:4; Isa 51:10. Furthermore, a new possible Babylonian background was hinted at for the fourth beast by referring to the *širusšur*²⁰ of Babylonian mythology (ibid. 455), although JEFFERY also considered a Canaanite background as a possibility (cf. p. 10).

In contrast to HEATON, who was the last all-out supporter of a Babylonian background, subsequent scholars mentioned only partial parallels, especially the notions of the primeval sea and the four winds. Among these are A.B. RHODES (1961: 416) who made reference to the four winds, while K. KOCH (1961: 9 with n. 2) referred

¹⁸ Similar BEEK 1935: 38.

¹⁹ Contra cf. the reference in n. 21.

²⁰ Possibly JEFFERY took up a suggestion by MONTGOMERY (cf. below p. 49).

to the sea, as did N.W. PORTEOUS (1962: 80) who traced the background of Dan 7 ultimately back to the Babylonian creation myth, but emphasised much more the role of the Ugaritic texts as transmitter and thereby their decisive influence on Dan 7.²¹ O. PLÖGER (1965: 108) and R. HAMMER (1976: 75) understood the four winds to be a symbol of the whole cosmos which is described in its primeval state before creation by the imagery of the chaotic sea, thereby alluding to the Babylonian creation myth.²² Among French exegetes M. DELCOR (1968: 295f; *ibid.* 1971: 143f) compared the sea to Tiamat in the Babylonian creation epic and A. LACOCQUE stated that "the four winds, for example, are instruments in the hand of Marduk which prevent Tiamat (the Primordial Ocean) from escaping" (1979: 138; *ibid.* 1976: 105), although both made allowance for a possible partial Canaanite background (cf. p. 11). Likewise J.E. GOLDINGAY (1988: 153) in his recent commentary on Daniel rejected a Babylonian mythological background for Dan 7,²³ but still maintained that the Babylonian myth *Enuma Elish* has links to Dan 7 that are hard to view as "coincidental" (*ibid.* 151), but which become much more meaningful with reference to the later Ugaritic combat myth. Finally, in a recent survey of the Danielic animal imagery, E.C. LUCAS upheld that "the phrase 'the four winds of heaven' and the imagery of the beasts arising out of the turbulent sea" (1990: 185; 2000: 69) suggests an influence from the Babylonian creation epic *Enuma Elish*, although "the number, form, and sequence of the monsters ... cannot be explained by appeal to *Enuma Elish*" (*ibid.* 165).²⁴

²¹ Thus, in the ascending beasts PORTEOUS could not see a parallel to the Babylonian creation myth that was worth mentioning whether in regard to appearance or function. If a parallel to the creation myth was to be sought the closest one would be the fourth beast, but only in regard to the appearance not in function due to the missing fight between God and the fourth beast. Because both the Ugaritic combat myth and Gen 1 do not report a fight between El and Leviathan, respectively God and the *tehom*, PORTEOUS (1962: 80) saw a parallel in these two texts with Dan 7. Cf. however TSUMURA (1989: 45–65) who rejected on the basis of linguistic arguments a direct or indirect connection between the creation story of Gen 1 and the Babylonian creation myth and Ugaritic Baal myth. Cf. also HEIDEL 1951: 102–114; WESTERMANN 1974: 145f; KLOOS 1986: 70–86; KVANVIG 1988: 504 and below, n. 22.

²² Although PLÖGER did not explicitly specify the underlying myth as the Babylonian creation myth, his parallels to creation are understood so, since the Ugaritic texts do not speak of the creation as such, although some understand them as cosmogonic (COLLINS 1977: 99; CLIFFORD 1984; GRØNBÆK 1985; SMITH 1986: 318–320).

²³ Cf. GOLDINGAY's criticism of the Babylonian background (1988: 153).

²⁴ Critical remarks against a Babylonian influence include the following (cf. also n. 204 on p. 57):

- (1) General statements criticised this position as too one-sided and exaggerated (JUNKER 1932: 33), too far-fetched (YOUNG 1954: 34), overstressed (LUCAS 1990: 162), and that the genuine similarities are very modest (BEEK 1935: 37f) "too few to demonstrate dependence" (CASEY 1979: 35), and are outweighed by the differences (DOUKHAN 1989: 154, n. 32);
- (2) Number, description, and combination of beasts do not correspond (JUNKER 1932: 36; DELCOR 1968: 296; STAUB 1978: 353; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = *ibid.* 1979: 139; PORTER 1983: 35; LUCAS 1990: 164f);
- (3) *Enuma Elish* is chronologically too far-removed from Dan 7 (STAUB 1978: 353);

2.2. Greek influence

Although proposals for Greek traditio–historical influence on Dan 7 did not have any significant impact, from a research historical perspective O. EISSFELDT's early position represents a preparatory step for the development of a Canaanite religio–historical background of Dan 7. In his religio–historical study of Baal Zaphon, EISSFELDT briefly touched on Dan 7, namely, only the fourth beast. EISSFELDT (1932: 23, 25) pointed out that the fight between Zeus and Typhon, as we find it in the Apollodorian library, is a reflection of an old myth going back to the second millennium²⁵ that was connected with the northern Syrian mountain range of the *mons Casius* which dominated the famous city of Ugarit. Because EISSFELDT saw in the Ugaritic dragon *ltn* a reference to the Greek god Typhon, he argued “dass wir auch aus Ras Schamra doch vielleicht noch etwas wie den Typhon–Mythus erwarten dürfen” (ibid. 24). In regard to Dan 7 EISSFELDT made a historical application equating the fourth beast with Typhon, respectively, the Seleucid kingdom and its king.²⁶ EISSFELDT (ibid. 26f) supported his argument by a descriptive comparison of the fourth beast in Dan 7 with the Greek god Typhon, as narrated by Apollodor. In stating his conclusions, EISSFELDT remarked:

Auch in Einzelheiten lassen sich trotz all der grossen Verschiedenheiten manche Übereinstimmungen zwischen dem vierten Tiere Daniels und dem Typhon Apollodors aufzeigen. Wichtiger aber ist dies, dass beiden gemeinsam ist der grausig–unheimliche Eindruck, den sie auf den Betrachter machen, und der freche Trotz, mit dem sie selbst gegen den obersten Gott vorgehen. Man wird also in der Tat annehmen dürfen, dass der Verfasser unseres Danielbuches oder der des ihm zugrunde liegenden älteren Buches oder auch

-
- (4) Dan 7 is not a *combat* myth: “The material in Dan. 7:2–7, however, does not, in our judgement, qualify as a chaos or combat myth. Combat myths usually entail direct conflict and accent divine intervention; whereas Dan. 7:2–7 presents an evolution within history. Succession of the four world empires in Dan. 7:2–7 is dependent, not on combat, but on the demise of the predecessor ... Therefore, it may be concluded that there is no combat myth in Dan 7. Rather, there is an expression of spatial and ethical dualism, which has been conceived by some scholars as implying a chaos or combat myth” (REID 1989: 82f; cf. also KOCH 1980: 231); cf. also n. 49 no. 7b on p. 13.

²⁵ According to EISSFELDT (1932: 5) the Greek cult of Zeus Casios succeeded the Baal cult at *mons Casius* respectively at the mountain of Zaphon.

²⁶ “Erwägt man nämlich, dass das vierte Tier von Dan 7 das Griechen– oder Seleukidenreich meint und dass der König dieses Reiches in Dan 11 mit Betonung ‘König des Nordens’ genannt wird, bedenkt man ferner, dass in Jes 27,1 die für Ras Schamra nachgewiesene Liwjatan–Gestalt von einem jüdischen Dichter oder Apokalyptiker als Symbol für Syrien verwendet worden ist, so drängt sich die Vermutung auf, dass in Dan 7 auf das Seleukidenreich und seinen König ein Mythus angewandt worden ist, der an dem Land des Nordens, ursprünglich wohl am Berge Zaphon, haftete, wie auch die drei ersten Tiere in einer uns freilich nicht mehr sicher erkennbaren Art mit dem Reich und Land, das sie repräsentieren, verknüpft sein mögen, dass es also die ‘Typhon’–Gestalt ist, die für das vierte Tier von Dan 7 und auch für Apc Joh 12. 13. 17 Modell gestanden hat” (EISSFELDT 1932: 25f).

der der Einzelvision von Kap. 7 den aus dem Gebiet des Griechen- oder Seleukidenkönigs stammenden Mythenstoff benutzt hat, um an ihm die Furchtbarkeit dieses Königs aufzuzeigen (ibid. 27).

While EISSFELDT, in his essay on Baal Zaphon published in 1932, focused primarily on a Typhonic perspective for the fourth beast of Dan 7,²⁷ he also introduced for the first time a Canaanite²⁸ element in the discussion on the background of Dan 7:2–8²⁹ by referring in passing to the dragon *ltn* without giving it a central role in his discussion – and unintentionally associating it with the Canaanite³⁰ school of the religio-historical background of the first part of the vision of Dan 7.

KOCH (1961: 9, n. 1) followed EISSFELDT's early position, as J.W. VAN HENTEN (1993: 225, 235) also recently did albeit with a slight difference, in arguing that the author of Dan 7 used mythic features of *Seth*–Typhon to characterise Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164) as a Typhonic figure, although he did not exclude “Canaanite mythology as the principal source of information for Daniel 7” (ibid. 228).

2.3. Canaanite influence

As seen above in as early as 1932 EISSFELDT mentioned the Ugaritic texts in connection with Dan 7 without using them to point out a Canaanite³¹ background. The same position was maintained in EISSFELDT's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, published two years later. No reference to a Canaanite background of the fourth beast was made, only Typhon was mentioned.³² It is only with the second edition of EISSFELDT's *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1956 that a shift of the Canaanite role of the fourth beast to a more central position is discernible:

Von den vier Tieren in c. 7 ist das vierte deutlich mythlogischer Herkunft, wenn es auch kaum, wie GUNKEL gemeint hat, das Chaostier ist, das hier als Vorbild gedient hat, sondern eher eine im nördlichen Syrien, also im Bereich der damit symbolisierten Seleukidenmacht, beheimatete Typhon-Gestalt *oder*

²⁷ Cf. also KEARNS 1982: 128f, n. 179.

²⁸ On the relationship between the Canaanite and Greek tradition see ibid. p. 85, n. 2, and ibid. pp. 96f, n. 35.

²⁹ For the first overall Canaanite reference on the vision of Dan 7 see p. 58 with n. 205.

³⁰ Although the generalising term “Canaanite” seems not to be very accurate in reference to the adduced Ugaritic texts, it has to be remarked that these comparative passages are not considered to be the direct *Vorlage* of Dan 7 (cf. n. 114 on p. 32) but only an illustrative example of Canaanite traditions which “are best represented by the Ugaritic texts” (COLLINS 1977: 101). Since it is the general term used in scholarship when referring to the Ugaritic parallels to Dan 7 it will be retained.

³¹ In regard to the terminology see n. 30.

³² “Auch bei den Visionen von c. 7–12 lässt es sich sicher nachweisen, dass ihnen ältere Stoffe zugrunde liegen, insbesondere bei denen von c. 7 und 8. Von den vier Tieren in c. 7 ist das wie GUNKEL gemeint hat, das Chaosungeheuer ist, das hier zum Vorbild gedient hat, sondern eher eine im nördlichen Syrien, also im Bereich der damit symbolisierten Seleukidenmacht, beheimatete Typhon-Gestalt, und die Darstellung Persiens unter einem Widder und Syrien-Griechenland unter einem Stein- oder Ziegenbock in c. 8 ...” (EISSFELDT 1934: 578).

eines der Ungeheuer, mit denen nach den ugaritischen Texten Ba'al, von seiner Schwester 'Anat kräftig unterstützt, zu kämpfen hat [my emphasis], und die Darstellung Persiens ... (EISSFELDT 1956a: 648).

By referring also to the Ugaritic text³³ as a possibility rather than only to the late Greek Typhon tradition, EISSFELDT gave room for the option that the older Ugaritic material could be the primary background of Dan 7.

Despite EISSFELDT's early mention of the Ugaritic texts, it was BENTZEN who in 1937 truly initiated the Canaanite school of thought regarding the background of Dan 7. Although BENTZEN still seemed to equate the sea (cf. p. 5 with n. 17) and beasts of Dan 7 with the Babylonian cosmogony (1937: 31 = *ibid.* 1952: 59), he introduced a new Canaanite perspective in regard to the fourth beast:³⁴

Das vierte Tier (7–8), dass offenbar den Höhepunkt der Gottlosigkeit bezeichnet, scheint ... von der durch die Ras Shamra-Texte für etwa 1200 v. Chr. nachgewiesenen Liwjatan-Gestalt beeinflusst zu sein, die auch wohl in dem Typhon Apollodors weiterlebt und bei ihm eine aufs stärkste an c. 7 erinnernde Ausgestaltung erfahren hat (*ibid.* 33 = *ibid.* 1952: 61).

While EISSFELDT (cf. p. 8) emphasised up to 1934 the Typhonic aspect of the fourth beast, indicating only in 1956 the significance of the Ugaritic texts as the foundation for a primarily Canaanite interpretation, BENTZEN had shifted his focus as early as 1937 to the Canaanite texts, although he allowed the possibility that this motif was also used for Typhon later on. BENTZEN's Canaanite perspective was underlined in the second edition of his commentary on Daniel with a new reference to the sea (1952: 59)³⁵ by mentioning A.S. KAPELRUD'S (1952: 102ff) discussion on "Prince Sea" in the Ras Shamra texts.

The dual reference to the Ugaritic *ltn*/Leviathan and the Apollodorian Typhon was retained by BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) and JEFFERY (1956: 455) for the background of the fourth beast,³⁶ whereby the latter still attributed other features to a general Babylonian background (cf. p. 6).

As GUNKEL'S study was ground-breaking for a Babylonian background (cf. p. 3) and BENTZEN'S for a Canaanite background so is J. EMERTON'S (1958) contribution considered fundamental for the further development of the Canaanite school. In contrast to GUNKEL, who laid emphasis on the motif-complex of the sea, winds, and beasts, EMERTON approached his discussion on the background of Dan 7 from the imagery of the "son of man" (cf. p. 58). Nevertheless it is surprising that EMERTON devoted only one paragraph to the sea-winds-beasts motif in which he stated that "the Ugaritic texts tell of the slaying of the dragon *ltn* [typifying the sea god Yam],

³³ Compare the same passage of the first edition in n. 32.

³⁴ STEINMANN (1950: 110f = *ibid.* 1960: 87, 89) also compared the fourth beast with Leviathan but probably having only biblical references in mind.

³⁵ In the second edition of his Daniel commentary BENTZEN (1952: 59) also pointed out that while GUNKEL postulated only a single source he felt that this would be too restrictive, mentioning MEYER'S suggestion of an unknown myth that knew of four beasts rising out of the sea (cf. p. 4 with n. 14).

³⁶ Similar also FOHRER (1968: 476) still citing EISSFELDT'S "Baal Zaphon".

who is probably to be associated with the O.T. Leviathan" (1958: 228).³⁷ While EMERTON perceived in the first part of Dan 7 only a *general* influence by the Ugaritic motif of the slaying of the sea monster and the resulting kingship of the victor,³⁸ it is significant that he also attributed a considerable number of deviating details in this motif-complex to other influences.³⁹

After EMERTON, the Canaanite background of Dan 7 was increasingly referred to on the one hand as the most likely one, while on the other hand it was recognised that this influence on the first part of the Danielic vision is very often upon closer scrutiny seen to be vague, general and indirect.

Independently of EMERTON, L. ROST (1958: 41–43) published in the same year a short essay that similarly traced the "son of man" motif to Ugaritic mythology without explicitly referring to the motif of the sea, winds, and beasts.⁴⁰ RHODES (1961: 416) interpreted only the sea against the background of the Ugaritic sea-dragon Yam as did DELCOR (1968: 295f; *ibid.* 1971: 143f) while advocating a completely different origin for the beasts (cf. p. 17). C. COLPE, after EMERTON the next significant supporter of a Canaanite background, likewise gave only very brief attention to the motif-complex of the sea, winds, and beasts. Except for a statement that the fourth beast had to be equated with the chaos dragon *ltn* or the sea monster Yam, COLPE (1969: 418) did not adduce any other Ugaritic parallel for the whole motif-complex of the first part of the vision.⁴¹ As did his compatriot DELCOR,

³⁷ EMERTON (1958: 228, ns. 4 and 5) also made reference to the victory of the goddess Anat over the sea dragon (*ltn*) (DRIVER 1956: 86f, V. iii, esp. lines 55f), which is in fact attributed to Baal (*ibid.* 102–105, I* i, esp. lines 1–3 and 28f), and the victory of Baal over Yam, the sea (*ibid.* 77–83, esp. lines III* A 23–27), which he observed as related themes.

³⁸ The victory of Baal over the dragon *ltn*, as EMERTON (1958: 228) pointed out, seemed to have a bearing on his status as king, which he understood as being reflected in Dan 7:14, where the "son of man" is given dominion, glory and an everlasting kingdom after the destruction of the fourth beast: "The coming with clouds thus has a place in Dan. vii, which is organically related to the destruction of the beast from the sea and to the conferring of kingship. It is not explicitly stated that the 'son of man' kills the fourth beast, but the Canaanite parallels suggest that this occurred in the underlying myth" (*ibid.* 232).

³⁹ EMERTON (*ibid.* 227) mentioned the following other influences: Inner-Danielic (the number of four kingdoms), traditional sources (the number of four kingdoms), iconographic (the description of the beasts), Old Testament (the description of the beasts), independent origins (the rising out of the water of the beasts), and contributions from the author of the Book of Daniel himself (some details of the description of the beasts), and the needs of the situation (details of the description of the beasts and their story).

⁴⁰ Only indirectly ROST mentioned the Babylonian and Ugaritic mythology. He questioned what it was that gave the "son of man" the right to assume royal authority: "Soll man dabei an die Besiegung des Chaosdrachens denken, wie von Marduks Thronbesteigung berichtet wird? Oder sind es die Bitten der Anat gewesen, wie im ugaritischen Mythos?" (1958: 43). Furthermore, he mentioned that the vision of the four beasts is an ancient theme, which is separate from the "son of man" tradition (*ibid.* 41).

⁴¹ In connection with the symbols of the four beasts only a reference to Hos 13:7, 8 and two iconographic parallels (by citing NOTH 1957: 267–271) was made (COLPE 1969: 423, n. 167).

LACOCQUE (1976: 105 = *ibid.* 1979: 138, 130) pointed only very vaguely to some kind of Canaanite influence.⁴²

In a digression from his traditio–historical study of Baal–Hadad (cf. below pp. 62–65) R. KEARNS (1982: 124–129) also discussed Yam as chaos monster in Ugaritic texts. Although he mentioned the commonly–cited Old Testament passages as a reflection of this theme in regard to an apocalyptic adaptation in Dan 7:7, he concluded that possibly only meagre remnants survived. The typical designations of Yam as chaos monster are missing; what remains is solely his rebellious character (*ibid.* 129) which is not directed against any divine enemy (*ibid.* 134).⁴³

While G.R. BEASLEY–MURRAY (1983: 44 with n. 1) followed the Canaanite school without discussing details, J. DAY’s position displays the same differentiating approach as observed since EMERTON by accepting that the motif of the “sea hostile to God is of Canaanite origin” (1985: 152) but that:

Whilst the four beasts, and especially the last, appear to play the *role* ascribed to the dragon Leviathan in Canaanite mythology, the fact remains that the precise *form* of the beasts does not correspond to that of Leviathan and the other dragons attested in Ugaritic (*ibid.* 152f).⁴⁴

Despite the acknowledged limited Ugaritic influence on the first part of the vision of Dan 7, this traditio–historical explanation did not lose its attraction, so that even GOLDINGAY, who gave biblical traditions a central role in regard to the background of Dan 7 by stating that “appeal to foreign influence [is] inappropriate where

⁴² LACOCQUE mentioned the Canaanite influence especially in connection with the “son of man” motif (1979: 129) in a section (= *ibid.* 129–133) that was added in the English translation of his commentary. Only two instances mention imagery from the first part of the vision of Dan 7 in connection with Canaanite mythology: (1) a quote by CROSS (1973: 345), mentioning Yam and Leviathan (LACOCQUE 1979: 130); (2) a reference to the Canaanite myth of the god Yam as another option than the *Enuma Elish* which he seemed to favour (*ibid.* 138 = *ibid.* 1976: 105; cf. also p. 7 above). A connection between the fourth beast and the Ugaritic Leviathan was rejected (*ibid.* 141 = *ibid.* 1976: 107).

⁴³ Not very substantial is KEARNS’ evidence for a link between the destruction of Yam and the fourth beast by fire. KEARNS’ starting point for such a link is based on a single Ugaritic passage (CTA 4 V 70 = DRIVER 1956: 96; GIBSON 1978: 60) which mentions the call *ql* of Hadad (*w<j>tn.qlh.b ʾrpt*; “he will give his call into the clouds”; the English translation is based on KEARNS’ [1982: 139] German translation). According to KEARNS in the later history of the Hadad tradition Hadad’s call was transformed into a fiery weapon which destroyed his enemies (*ibid.* 142f). The oldest witness to this shift from call to fire is according to KEARNS (*ibid.* 163) Psa 29:7: קול יהוה חצב להבות אש “The call of Yahweh kills (with) flames (and) fire” (translation according to KEARNS). KEARNS (*ibid.* 154) noted that the verb חצב is problematic in this passage in so far as no attested Hebrew meaning seems to fit. Proposals include “cleave”, “split”, “hollow out or carve”, “poke up (fire)”, “spray”, “lay about”, “smite” (*ibid.* 154f with ns. 312–315, 319). Implying a dependence on the Hadad tradition, KEARNS (*ibid.* 155) proposed the connotation of “smite”, “kill” for חצב in Psa 29:7. A very distant reflection of such a fiery destruction of Yam by Hadad – as is alluded to in Psa 29 – is according to KEARNS also likely in the case of Dan 7:11, which describes the destruction of the fourth beast by fire, “falls das vierte furchtbare Tier eine Verwertung von Jamm sein sollte” (*ibid.* 166).

⁴⁴ On DAY’s position for the origin of the form of the beasts see n. 109 on p. 31.

the material has Jewish parallels" (1988: 150), could not dismiss the parallels in the "Ugaritic combat myth *Baal*, which has more links with Daniel 7 [than the *Enuma Elish*] ..." (ibid. 151).

The last to be mentioned is **J.J. COLLINS**, presently the most prominent advocate of the Canaanite school. According to COLLINS, the author of Dan 7 used traditional Old Testament imagery⁴⁵ which in turn had been formed by Canaanite myths, thereby also indicating that the Canaanite influence on Dan 7 was only an indirect one.⁴⁶ Thus COLLINS traced the motif of the sea back to the Canaanite mythological motif of Yam and saw in the Danielic beasts variants of the Ugaritic dragon *ltn* (1993b: 286–289; cf. also ibid. 1977: 98f).⁴⁷ On the other hand, COLLINS, in common with EMERTON, also attributed most of the details of the first part of the vision of Dan 7 to various other influences.⁴⁸ While COLLINS admitted that many details of the first part of the vision of Dan 7 are not derived from Ugaritic myths, he still maintained that:

there is a point of analogy, insofar as both [the Ugaritic *ltn* and the fourth beast of Dan 7] are monsters associated with the sea and opposed to the good god in the story. Most scholars, however, see the analogy against a broader background. The primary enemy, both in Daniel and in the Canaanite myth, is the sea, Yamm (1993b: 288).⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Cf. his reference to Job 26:7, 12, 13; Psa 89:9–11; 74:13–17; Isa 51:9, 10; 17:12–14; 27:1 (COLLINS 1977: 96f).

⁴⁶ "There is no doubt that the Canaanite myths have most directly influenced the biblical tradition" (ibid. 98), but although "the tradition [of Dan 7] is ultimately of Canaanite origin ... the symbolism of the sea is familiar from the Hebrew Bible and does not itself require direct acquaintance with Canaanite sources" (ibid. 1993a: 126 = ibid. 1993b: 289; cf. also ibid. 1975: 596f).

⁴⁷ As a further parallel COLLINS (1977: 99) pointed to the four heads of the third beast and the ten horns of the fourth beast, which he interpreted as a reflection of the Ugaritic dragon with its seven heads. However, in his recent commentary on Daniel he retracted somewhat from this parallel: "The correspondence between *Lôtān*/Leviathan and the fourth beast of Daniel 7 is not exact. The name is not found in Daniel and the description is not that of a serpent with seven heads" (ibid. 1993b: 288).

⁴⁸ Thus, COLLINS (ibid. 289) stated that "the description of the individual beasts, however, cannot be explained from any Canaanite sources now available." Furthermore, "Daniel speaks of *four* beasts that come up out of the sea" (ibid. 291). As origin for the description of the beasts COLLINS assumed biblical tradition and hybrid forms of Mesopotamian mythology (ibid. 289) and art in general (ibid. 285). The function of the beast, i.e., that they represent kingdoms was understood by COLLINS as a reflection of traditional Hebrew and Ugaritic usage of names of male animals to designate nobility, and the figure of four kingdoms, is explained as traditional sequence which presumably derived from Dan 2 (ibid. 1977: 104).

⁴⁹ Critical remarks against a Canaanite influence include the following (cf. also n. 256 on p. 70):

(1) The sea in Dan 7: (a) is not divine (FERCH 1980: 81) and not animate (ibid.; KVANVIG 1988: 508); (b) is not a chaos symbol but interpreted as the earth (FERCH 1980: 81); cf. however the objection by COLLINS: "Ferch objects that 'the sea and beast are interpreted as the earth and four kings or kingdoms and not as chaos sym-

-
- bols.' This is to confuse the reference of the symbols (the kings/kingdoms) with their expressive value (chaos symbols)" (1981: 92f);
- (2) Winged deities are almost non-existent in Ugaritic mythology (FERCH 1980: 81);
 - (3) The four beasts: (a) no specific parallel for any beast (KVANVIG 1988: 508; PORTER 1983: 35; FERCH 1980: 81; BRYAN 1995: 233; cf. also DAY above on p. 12); (b) the beasts are not chaos symbols but interpreted as four kings or kingdoms (ibid.); cf. however no. 1b above; (c) all four beasts leave the water since they are not aquatic animals, in contrast to the Ugaritic Leviathan whose realm is the sea (COPPENS 1968: 500; cf. similar already KRAELING 1927: 145 as well as GUNKEL above in n. 9, no. 5 on p. 3);
 - (4) The historical perspective associated with the beasts in Dan 7 is missing in the Ugaritic texts (FERCH 1980: 81);
 - (5) The fourth beast/Leviathan: (a) Lotan is only mentioned once in the Ugaritic texts (ibid. 79); (b) Lotan or Leviathan is not mentioned in Dan 7 (ibid. 80); (c) the parallel is not obvious (LACOCQUE 1976: 107 = ibid. 1979: 141; cf. also KEARNS above on p. 12) since the features do not coincide (COPPENS 1968: 500; FERCH 1980: 80); (d) Dan 7 declines any comparison by emphasising the unique nature of the fourth beast (PLOGER 1965: 109);
 - (6) Ugaritic texts are chronologically too far-removed from Daniel and without convincing (extra-biblical) transmission history (CAQUOT 1967: 55; DELCOR 1968: 297; STAUB 1978: 353; MOSCA 1986: 498);
 - (7) Dan 7 is not a *combat* myth: (a) cf. n. 24, no. 4 on p. 7; (b) "the fourth beast in Daniel 7 meets its demise not in a combat with the 'son of man'" (FERCH 1980: 80; cf. also n. 256, no. 2c on p. 70);
 - (8) No direct dependence on the Ugaritic mythology is necessary since the Old Testament provides the source for the images and motifs (MOSCA 1986: 500–502; CASEY 1979: 18; KVANVIG 1988: 350, n. 24; cf. also HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; DOUKHAN 1989: 154, n. 32);
 - (9) A "conservative defender of the traditional faith" (CASEY 1979: 18; cf. also CARAGOUNIS 1986: 38) would use native Israelite imagery. Cf. the response by COLLINS: "...some critics demand 'congeniality in ideological standpoint between the presumed background and the author of our text', with the implication that pagan mythology is in principle not congenial to the work of a pious Jew. This formulation of the issue assumes that the ideological standpoint of the text is clear-cut, and risks confusing what is congenial to the text with what is congenial to the critic. Appropriation of foreign motifs and thought patterns requires that some aspect of the presumed background be congenial to the author, but does not require identity of outlook ... Whether pagan myths constitute the background to Daniel 7 must be judged by the light they throw on the text, not pre-judged by modern assumptions about what is permissible for an ancient Jew" (1993a: 123 = ibid. 1993b: 282);
 - (10) "... religio-historical parallels should be considered against the totality of the phenomenological conceptions of the works in which such correspondences occur. Likewise ... single motifs [should not be] torn out of their living contexts" (FERCH 1980: 75); cf. the response by COLLINS: "These principles are quite valid if we wish to compare the message of Daniel, or its pattern of religion, with that of the Ugaritic myths. Such comparison has never, to my knowledge, been the issue in the parallels between Daniel and Ugarit, and is rarely if ever involved in the identification of any mythological allusions in apocalyptic literature. Equally, scholars who identify mythological images do not claim that they have the same meaning or reference in their new contexts ... Pace Ferch, traditional images are constantly 'torn from their living contexts' and transferred to new ones ... No scholar has ever denied that there

2.4. Astrological influence

The first remark referring to astrological influence in the Book of Daniel goes back to a private communication by **M.F.C. BURKITT** to **F. CUMONT** in 1909:

Le choix de ces animaux [referring to the ram and he-goat of Dan 8:20, 21] symboliques parait avoir été inspiré par la théorie [i.e., astral-geography⁵⁰] qui soumettait la Perse au Bélier, la Syrie au Capricorne (Αἰγόκερως) (CUMONT 1909: 273).

BURKITT's suggestion that the choice of the ram and the he-goat in Dan 8 as symbols for the Persians and Syrians⁵¹ was motivated by the Zodiac signs of Aries and Capricorn, associated in astral-geography with these two peoples, was subsequently taken up by many scholars.

Among these scholars was **F. BOLL** (1914: 46) who attempted to locate the underlying imagery of the book of Revelation. In a final remark on the "son of man" in Rev 1:13–16, BOLL (ibid. 50–53) suggested a remote dependence on the imagery of the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" in Dan 7, whereby he equated the latter with the "man" mentioned in Dan 10:5, 6. BOLL traced the origin of these Danielic passages to astrological literature and cited as examples several passages from two Hermetic books.⁵² In his list of parallels he failed however to mention Dan 7. Apart

is 'discontinuity' between Daniel 7 and Ugarit, or indeed that the discontinuity is more significant than the continuity in determining the present image of the text. All that is claimed is that the imagery of Daniel has traditional associations and that these associations are one significant factor in the communicative power of the text" (1981: 91; cf. also ibid. 1993b: 281 = ibid. 1993a: 124);

- (11) Parallels are inadequate and not specific enough (CASEY 1979: 35; KVANVIG 1988: 509) therefore "in the light of the complexities just noted [in the Ugaritic texts], it becomes apparent that religio-historical parallels must not be established too readily. It is a methodological necessity to examine single parallel terms and motifs in the total context in which they occur. To study parallels in isolation is to open oneself to the danger of misreading elements of one culture in terms of another and of suppression of adverse evidence in the interests of a theory" (FERCH 1980: 79); cf. the response by COLLINS: "... we cannot demand exact reproduction of the myth, and the symbols do not necessarily carry the same reference as in the original ... What carries over are the allusions and associations ... The pattern of the relationship here is more important than the variation in detail" (1981: 92f); "It should be no surprise that his composition is a new entity, discontinuous in some respects with all its sources. What is significant is whether there are also aspects of the text that are rendered more intelligible when considered in the context of the proposed background" (ibid. 1993b: 282; cf. also ibid. 1993a: 124 and above ns. 39 on p. 11 and 48 on p. 13).

⁵⁰ According to astral-geography astrological constellations, represented by animals, influence the destiny of nations and individuals (cf. CAQUOT 1955: 9f).

⁵¹ But cf. the apt remark of DAY (1985: 154) that the he-goat in Dan 8:21 according to the text does not represent Syria but Greece.

⁵² I.e., Σαλμενιχιακά/Σαλμεσχοινιακά and Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιὸν ἡ λεγομένη ἱερὰ βίβλος. No direct relationship between Daniel and the two Hermetic books were claimed, since "das einzelne Bild immer in einem Teil [von den] Einzelheiten [ab]weicht, da es sich ja

from Eze 1:7 and eight passages from Revelation, BOLL listed only Dan 10:5, 6 as Danielic parallel to his Hermetic material.

While **H. GRESSMANN** made numerous contributions to the study of the background of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 (cf. pp. 55, 73, 75, 79, 107), only one dealt with the first part, namely, his brief mention of the rising out of the sea of the four beasts as an astrological reflex of Babylonian–Iranian astrology which knows of a primeval cave below the sea being the abode of the god of destiny (1925: 19).

The tentative beginnings of proposals for astrological influence on Dan 7 were finally shaken off with an all-out pan-astrological interpretation by **R. EISLER** who traced everything that the visionary of Dan 7 saw to astral-geography (1930: 660–665).⁵³

Considerably more modest was **J. STEINMANN** (1950: 108 = *ibid.* 1960: 85) who argued that the wings of the lion are indicative of the astrological origin of this symbol.

The most influential proponent of an astral-geographical interpretation of the first part of Dan 7 was the Frenchman, **A. CAQUOT**, who found a balance between the indecisive early attempts and the untenable imaginations of EISLER. After suggesting that the four beasts of Dan 7 represented the four directions of the earth which were occupied by Babylon in the South, Media in the North, Persia in the East, and Greeks in the West,⁵⁴ CAQUOT (1955: 9–12) applied the principles of astral-geography, as had been done with Dan 8. However, he was unable to make the same equations as had been done in Dan 8, i.e., “Zodiac X rules over nation Y”, because only one animal, namely, the lion, appeared in the signs of the Zodiac and even in this case the lion was not associated with Babylonia.⁵⁵ Thus CAQUOT was forced to find an astral-geographical list of animals other than the generally-used twelve Zodiac signs. He found them in the so-called *paranatellonta*⁵⁶ as used in the

nicht um eine unmittelbare Quelle für die apokalyptische Tradition handeln kann, sondern nur um einen Gesamttypus von verwandter Prägung” (BOLL 1914: 52).

⁵³ Thus, EISLER (1930: 664f) explained the four winds as the four *κέντρα κόσμου*, the four corners of the world, and the four beasts rising out of the sea as the rising signs of the Zodiac. The lion was equated by EISLER with the Zodiac of Leo. Based on a “corrected” verse order (*ibid.* 662f), the iron teeth (dual!) of verse 7 and the three ribs of verse 5 were attributed to the lion and interpreted as the two bright stars ϵ and μ and as the main stars of the constellation below the Zodiac of Leo. The bear was associated with the Zodiac of the Great Bear and the panther with that of Pegasus. Based again on a correction of the text, the fourth beast of Dan 7 was fitted out with the eagle’s wings of verse 4 explaining it therefore as the Zodiac of the Eagle.

⁵⁴ CAQUOT (1955: 9) saw in the order of Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece the Babylonian tradition that associated the four winds in the following sequence: South, North, East, West.

⁵⁵ LUCAS (1990: 178) pointedly remarked that CAQUOT (1955: 12) on the one hand acknowledged that the lion was not associated with Babylon, but on the other hand failed to indicate that Leo rules over Asia.

⁵⁶ The *paranatellonta* are three “accompanying constellations” for each of the 12 signs of the Zodiac, which are also represented by animals and exert influence over a particular region of the earth. For a brief summary of the whole concept see in English LUCAS 1990: 178, in German STAUB 1978: 356, n. 15.

Babylonian list of Teucer, dating from the 2nd century B.C.E. Unfortunately this list did not completely match Dan 7 either. Thus Persia was not represented by the leopard but by the cat. CAQUOT explained this substitution of one feline with another by the remark: "Le chat ... paraît avoir été inconnu des Sémites: Il n'a de nom ni en accadien, ni en araméen, ni en hébreu biblique. Il est donc possible qu'on lui ait substitué un autre félin" (ibid. 11). In the case of Media, CAQUOT was faced with the problem, that it did not appear in Teucer's list at all. However, CAQUOT argued that:

dans Teucros, un des décans⁵⁷ du Cancer, affecté au Nord, a l'ourse pour symbole et la chorographie met l'Arménie sous sa dépendance ... Comme l'Arménie, la Médie est rangée par les astrologues dans les pays du Nord ... (ibid.).

After solving the problem of Media by associating it with the northern region next to Armenia upon which the bear exerts its influence, CAQUOT had to solve the problem of the lion which was associated in Teucer's list with Asia and not with Babylonia (which stands according to Teucer under the influence of the dog). This was achieved by referring to Ptolemy who associated Mesopotamia with Leo. CAQUOT pointed out that there was no astrological animal that could adequately represent the terrible fourth power. Thus he argued that it was replaced by an imaginary composite creature that met the imagination of the listeners, "non pas en leur évoquant le dragon du chaos babylonien, ni le ougaritique, mais plus simplement le Léviathan des Prophètes et des Psaumes, la Bête de la mer, de l'Ouest" (ibid. 12).⁵⁸

CAQUOT'S explanation was followed by E. BICKERMANN (1967: 102), DELCOR (1968: 299; ibid. 1971: 145–147), and M. CASEY (1978: 20), while Z. ZEVIT (1968: 391f) reluctantly accepted it as the least unsatisfactory among those presented. Even COLLINS (1975: 601) in one of his early treatments on Dan 7 considered an astrological explanation for the choice of the Danielic beasts,⁵⁹ a position he abandoned later on.⁶⁰ The possibility of astrological influence was also hinted at by LACOCQUE (1979: 139; ibid. 1976: 106) and more recently by P. MOSCA (1986: 499, n. 17) and M. BARKER (1987: 123, n. 29).⁶¹

⁵⁷ I.e., a specific constellation of the *paranatellonta*.

⁵⁸ More than a decade later CAQUOT (1967: 39) reaffirmed his position as pointed out in 1955.

⁵⁹ "The choice of those particular beasts probably derives from the signs of the Zodiac" (COLLINS 1975: 601).

⁶⁰ Cf. the most recent statement of COLLINS (1993b: 295, n. 153) in which he assessed the astrological explanation put forward by CAQUOT as "extremely hypothetical".

⁶¹ Critical remarks against an astrological influence include the following:

(1) CAQUOT used questionable manipulation and argumentation with no immediate evidence in regard to the equation between Media and the bear, the connection of the lion with Babylon, and the substitute of the leopard with the cat (COPPENS 1969: 125; DAY 1985: 155; GOLDINGAY 1988: 151; COLLINS 1993b: 295, n. 153), whereby the rationale for the substitution of the leopard by the cat is undermined by (a) the post-biblical Hebrew word *ḥātūl* denoting "cat"; (b) the mentioning of the cat in the Letter of Jeremiah 21 (c. 300 B.C.E.), so that "therefore [is] no reason why Daniel 7 should not have alluded to the cat if precise symbolism was required" (DAY 1985: 155).

2.5. Phoenician influence

The attempt to establish a Phoenician influence on the first part of the vision in Dan 7 was restricted to verse 2 and to the final decade of the 19th century and the first year of last century. In his commentary on Daniel **A.A. BEVAN** (1892: 120, n. 1) referred to **R. SMITH** who suggested that Dan 7:2 is borrowed from the Phoenicians who “believed the world (Αἰών), personified as a man, to have been born ἐκ τοῦ Κολπία ἀνέμου καὶ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Βάαυ (i.e., Hebr. בְּהוּ). Here the wind Kolphia seems to be כָּל רוּחַ פְּאָה ‘the wind from every quarter’”. The same argument was taken up only once, namely, by **MARTI** (1901: 49).

2.6. Iranian influence

While proposals for an Iranian influence are numerous for the second part of the vision of Dan 7, they did not have a significant impact on the first part. **D. VÖLTER** compared the beasts in Dan 7 to the gruesome beasts and tyrannical kings who were the instruments of *Ahriman* (1902: 173). A similar position was held by **ZIMMERN** (**SCHRADER/ZIMMERN/WINCKLER** 1903: 508). **MEYER** likened the demise of the fourth beast within the judgement scene of Dan 7 to the Iranian serpent-like *Azi* and dragon-like *Azi Dahaka* (1921: 199).⁶² **A. FREIHERR VON GALL** (1926: 267) took up **MEYER**’S suggestion and claimed that although the imagery of the four beasts is

LUCAS (1990: 180) also cited Akkadian evidence for the occurrence of the cat in literature from Old Babylonian times onwards;

- (2) The very basis from which **CAQUOT** launched his thesis is questionable, namely, that Dan 8 also reflects the influence of Teucer’s astral-geography, because (a) the he-goat of Dan 8:21 is not equated with Syria but with Greece (**DAY** 1985: 154; **LUCAS** 1990: 182); (b) when the Greeks took over from the Babylonians the 12 signs of the Zodiac were all translated into Greek names with one exception, namely, the Ram, whose Babylonian name was *hun.ga = agru*, “the hireling” (the origin of the later Greek equivalent is not known). Hence even on Seleucid tablets the traditional Babylonian designations were used, so that “one would hardly expect the Ram to appear as an astrological symbol ...” (ibid. 181);
 - (3) A system of 36 esoteric symbols would hardly have been understood by the readers of Dan 7 (**STAUB** 1978: 357);
 - (4) “Also, Caquot fails to note that Ptolemy treats Babylonia, Assyria, and Chaldea as separate countries, and it is only Chaldea that he puts under Leo. The others he puts directly under Virgo. These considerations show that there are too many problems and uncertainties in Caquot’s thesis for it to carry conviction” (**LUCAS** 1990: 181);
 - (5) **LUCAS** (ibid. 180) reminds that Teucer’s system is not a Babylonian, but an Egyptian system (**CAQUOT** 1955: 11; **STAUB** 1978: 356, n. 15) in a Hellenised form that was known in Babylonia by the first century C.E., whereby **LUCAS** even questions the Babylonian location of Teucer. Thus “this casts considerable doubt on the validity of Caquot’s appeal to Teucros’ schema to illuminate the animal imagery of Daniel 7, especially when there is so little direct correspondence between the animals and countries of that chapter and of the astrological schema” (ibid. 180f);
 - (6) No astrological equivalent was produced for the fourth beast (**PORTER** 1983: 35).
- ⁶² The animals as such **MEYER** compared with Babylonian mythology (cf. p. 4).

of Babylonian origin, these beasts represent in reality Persian demons in Babylonian garb, particularly the fourth beast. **KRAELING** considered **MEYER**'s Iranian explanation of the fate of the fourth beast "not impossible" but most likely "improbable" (1933: 229). Recently **S.B. REID** argued that although the four beasts are an "*ad hoc* creation of the author", following thereby **L.F. HARTMAN/A. DI LELLA** (1978: 212), the animal imagery acts merely "as a vehicle for the historical [four world empire] schema" (REID 1989: 84) which REID perceived as indicative that "the original setting of the animal imagery ... may well have been Persian" (ibid. 90).⁶³

2.7. *Egyptian influence*

Against the background of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164), **J.C.H. LEBRAM** pointed out that the enemy of God's people in Dan 7 acts "als eine Art Gegentypus des ägyptischen Königs ..., dessen Funktion auch durch die Polarität von Erhaltung und Störung der Ordnung bestimmt ist" (1975: 747). **LEBRAM** proceeded to argue that Egypt provided a similar tradition of prophecy⁶⁴ with a literary structure akin to Jewish apocalyptic prophecy. He concluded that "die Darstellung des Antiochus als des Feindes der göttlichen Ordnung unter dem Einfluss spätägyptischer Geschichtsinterpretation steht" (ibid. 749), which associated the "gottfeindlichen fremdländischen" king with Typhon⁶⁵ – the Greek form of the Egyptian god Seth (ibid. 1984: 89). As vehicle of transmission **LEBRAM** singled out wisdom literature (ibid. 1975: 749f). More specific parallels to Dan 7 were not made.⁶⁶

2.8. *Treaty curse imagery influence*

T. WITTSTRUCK (1978: 100–102) suggested that the influence of treaty curses accounts for the final shape of the beast imagery of Dan 7. He cited two Sefire inscriptions (Sf I A 30–31; Sf II A 9)⁶⁷ of which the first has the animal sequence as snake, scorpion, bear, leopard, and the second as lion, [lacuna], leopard. On the basis of the first inscription he conjectured that the lacuna of the second inscription had to be read "bear," thereby resulting in the same sequence as in Dan 7. As additional support **WITTSTRUCK** referred to Hos 13:7, 8; Jer 5:6; 15:3.⁶⁸

⁶³ As a critical remark to an Iranian influence on this part of the vision **COLLINS** (1993b: 283) pointed out that there is no explanation for the beasts rising out of the sea (cf. also n. 274 on p. 76).

⁶⁴ Referred to were: "The Prophecy of Nefer-rohu" (cf. **WILSON** 1969b: 444–446), "The Demotic Chronicle" (cf. **MCCOWN** 1925: 387–392), and "The Oracle of the Potter" (cf. **KOENEN** 1968: 178–209).

⁶⁵ On Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Typhon see **VAN HENTEN** 1993: 223–243.

⁶⁶ Regarding to criticism of an Egyptian influence cf. the remark in n. 63 which was also applied to a suggested Egyptian background.

⁶⁷ Sf I A 30–31 (FITZMYER 1967: 14f): "May the gods send every sort of devourer against Arpad and against its people! [May the mo]uth of a snake [eat], the mouth of a scorpion, the mouth of a bear, the mouth of a leopard!"; Sf II A 9 (ibid. 80f): "[... and may] the mouth of a lion [eat] and the mouth of [a ...] and the mouth of a leopard!".

⁶⁸ Critical remarks against a treaty curse imagery influence include the following:

2.9. Birth omen influence

P.A. PORTER drew attention to the parallels between the peculiar physical characteristics of the beasts of Dan 7 and 8⁶⁹ and the Mesopotamian birth omen series “*Shumma Izbu*” (‘If an anomaly ...’), a collection of at least twenty-four tablets in which anomalous human and animal births and their bearing on the future affairs of both individuals and state are delineated” (1983: 16).

PORTER (ibid. 17–22) listed four different types of parallels: (1) *common peculiar physical features*,⁷⁰ (2) *historical omens* that identify birth anomalies with spe-

- (1) In the same volume of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in which WITTSTRUCK published his proposal RIMBACH (1978: 565f) remarked that the reading of “bear” (*dbhh*) as well as “leopard” (*nmrh*) in Sf IA 30–31 are very uncertain due to damage (cf. also FITZMYER 1967: 48f and DUPONT-SOMMER 1960: 242). Secondly, RIMBACH pointed out that the reading “bee” (*dbrrh*) and “ant” are much more suitable in the context of the curse, which “centers on the destruction of vegetation and enumerates reptiles and insects as the agency of such destruction” (ibid. 565), thus resulting in the sequence: snake, scorpion, bee, ant, moth, louse, whereby the latter two insects are taken from the extended context. With this the conjecture of “bear” in the second Sefire inscription (Sf II A 9) seems even on weaker ground, than it was due to the lacuna itself (cf. also GOLDINGAY 1988: 151; PORTER 1983: 36);
- (2) DAY (1985: 154), following basically RIMBACH, added: “... it is doubtful whether Sefire treaty I A 31 can give one confidence in this, since the leopard is the only animal common to both lists as they stand” (cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 295, n. 154) and “even if the sequence lion, bear, leopard were attested in the eighth-century B.C. Syrian Sefire treaty, it would be extremely hazardous to conclude that it must therefore be treaty usage which lies behind the beasts in the second century B.C. book of Daniel” (DAY 1985: 154).

⁶⁹ PORTER (1983: 22–27) extended his investigation also to the Bokkhoris Lamb tradition, 1 En 85–90, the Testament of Joseph 19, and the Revelation of John.

⁷⁰ The following parallels of animals raised on one side, multiple-headed animals, multiple-horned animals, animals with displaced eyes, horned animals with claws were mentioned by PORTER (1983: 17f) for chapter 7:

Daniel

7:5 And behold, another beast, a second one, like a bear. *It was raised up on one side ...*

7:5 it had three *ribs* in its mouth between its teeth ...

7:6 After this I looked, and lo, another, like a leopard ... and *the beast had four heads*; and dominion was given to it.

Shumma Izbu

XIV 10 If an anomaly's *right shoulder is raised* – your enemy will carry off the power of your country; a palace official will die; birth of a moron in your land.

XIV 11 If an anomaly's *left shoulder is raised* – the prince will carry off the power of the enemy land; birth of a moron in the enemy land.

XVII 16' If an anomaly holds *its lung(s) in its mouth* – a strong king [...]

VII A 1–2 If an anomaly has *two heads*, but (only) one neck – the king will conquer wherever he turns; he will conquer a land which does not belong to him (var.), the king will have no opponent.

VAT 17293 If an anomaly has four heads (mentioned by PORTER [ibid. 19, n. 20] as probably belonging to tablet VIII of the *Shumma Izbu*; translated by LUCAS 1990: 175).

cific kings;⁷¹ (3) an anomaly as basis for a *time prediction*;⁷² (4) the *Shumma Izbu* series that knows a comparative form, similar to Dan 7, where *beasts*⁷³ are likened instead of being identified.⁷⁴ An additional parallel is mentioned by PORTER (ibid. 28) when he stated that “the fact that certain details in the visions find no specific correspondence in the interpretation and vice versa – is comparable to a

7:7 After this I saw in the night visions, and behold, a fourth beast, ... and it had ten horns.

7:8 ... and behold, in this horn were eyes ...

7:19 the fourth beast ... with its .. claws of bronze

IX 64' If an anomaly has *one horn on its left and two on its forehead*, and none on the right – overthrow of the army of the prince; the army of the enemy [...]

X 42' If an anomaly's eyes are on the top of its head – end of the reign.

X 63' If an anomaly's eyes are normal, but it has a *third one on its hoof* – an enemy will overthrow the prince's auxiliary troops.

XIX 15' If a cow gives birth and (the calf's) *fore-feet are like the paws of a lion* – the prince's weapon.

XIV 47 If an anomaly's *four legs are like the paws of a lion* – [...]

- ⁷¹ PORTER (1983: 20) mentioned only one less specific example for Dan 7 (all others were for Dan 8):

Daniel

7:24 As for the ten horns, *out of this kingdom ten kings shall arise, and another shall arise after them; he shall be different from the former ones, and shall put down three kings.*

Shumma Izbu

VII 80' If an anomaly has two heads, two spines, six (sets of) ribs, two tails, six feet, three eyes, (and) three bases – *the sons of the king will fight among themselves, and one among them will fall.*

- ⁷² PORTER (ibid. 20f) gave only a single example for Dan 7 and 8:

Daniel

7:24, 25 As for the ten horns ... another shall arise after them ... the saints of the Most High ... shall be given into his hand for a time, two times, and half a time.

Shumma Izbu

XX 19' If a mare bears twins and they have one chest, two heads[...] two hips [...] normal feet, tail and hair – the days of the prince will be long; [...] the king will become strong; the land will not be happy for *six years*; its (the mare's) owner will die.

- ⁷³ Therefore, PORTER interpreted the comparative form “like a son of man” as reference to a figure that “is not necessarily a member of the human species” (ibid. 28).

- ⁷⁴ PORTER (ibid. 22) mentioned four examples for Dan 7 (the phrase “if a ewe gives birth to” has to be understood according to Old Babylonian omens as “If a ewe gives birth to an anomaly like”; cf. ibid. 21):

Daniel

7:4 The first was like a lion and had eagles' wings ...

7:5 And behold, another beast, a second one, like a bear ...

7:6 After this I looked, and lo, another, like a leopard ...

7:13 I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man ...

Shumma Izbu

V 50 If a ewe gives birth to a lion, and it has the head of a *hugu*-bird – the son of a widow will seize the throne.

V 107 If a ewe gives birth to a bear – a person with no right to the throne will seize it.

V 96 If a ewe gives birth to a leopard – a prince will seize universal kingship.

V 51 If a ewe gives birth to a lion, and it has a human face – ...

XVIII 33' If a goat gives birth to a human, (var.), a cripple – [...]

XX 24' If a mare gives birth to a human – the whole land will have good fortune.

similar lack of detailed correspondence between protasis and apodosis in numerous birth-omen texts.” PORTER concluded his discussion on the physical peculiarities of Dan 7 and 8 by pointing out that “... the animal anomalies in these visions originally had an evocative power by virtue of their stylistic dependence on Mesopotamian omen literature, rather than because of any perceived literal absurdity” (ibid. 29).

After discussing the *physical features* of the animals of Dan 7 and 8, PORTER (ibid. 33–42) proposed that the *function* of these animal images is dominated by and accounted for by the root metaphor of the shepherd (mediated by the office of the king) by comparing them to the Animal Apocalypse of 1 En 85–90 (ibid. 43–60), the Old Testament lamentation literature, and other ancient Near Eastern texts (ibid. 61–120). PORTER’S position received sympathetic evaluation by GOLDINGAY (1988: 151). LUCAS after having criticised PORTER a decade ago holds now that “the visions [i.e., Dan 7 and 8] come from a milieu where birth omens were part of the general culture” (2000: 72) however without claiming a “*direct* dependence on particular creatures described in the omens” (ibid. 71f).⁷⁵

⁷⁵ Cf. also the repeated references to PORTER in GOLDINGAY’S commentary on the text of Dan 7 (1988: 161–163).

Critical remarks against a birth omen influence include the following:

- (1) There are no parallels for winged animals (LUCAS 1990: 174; BRYAN 1995: 226; LUCAS 2000: 71);
- (2) Suggested anomalies as parallels for the “son of man” are “far-fetched” (BRYAN 1995: 226f);
- (3) The features of the beast of Dan 7 can also be explained as “the result of the author’s imagination working on the historical referent in the light of the images of *Mischwesen* that are common in Babylonian art, mythology, and birth omens. There need be no direct dependence on the omens” (ibid. 1990: 174f; ibid. 2000: 71f);
- (4) The *Mischwesen* of Dan 7 are symbols of evil empires while “the *Šumma Izbu* series are portents of both good and evil events” (BRYAN 1995: 227);
- (5) In Dan 7 the symbols “stand in direct, allegorical, relationship to the historical referent ... The relationship between the form of the *izbu* and the historical events in the apodosis is unclear. There is certainly no direct symbol-referent relationship” (ibid. 175);
- (6) If a mantic wise man was responsible for Dan 7 “one would expect the language ... to be patterned on the canonical phraseology if dependent, in a literary sense, on the omens” (ibid.);
- (7) The Babylonian birth omen traditions in the Levant did not continue beyond the Late Bronze Age. In Greek divination birth omens did not play a major role (ibid. 177);
- (8) The case for the root metaphor of the shepherd as origin for the animal metaphors of Dan 7 is weakened because in Dan 7 “the motif of sheep and shepherd is not explicitly present” (COLLINS 1993b: 303, n. 235);
- (9) The parallels between the Animal Apocalypse and Dan 7 and 8 are not entirely convincing, because (a) the shepherds in 1 En 85–90 are not described as beasts; (b) the beast representing foreign powers in the Animal Apocalypse are normal and not monstrous; (c) the beasts in Dan 7 function once as (king)-shepherds and on the other as subjects of the “son of man”-shepherd, which is a highly unlikely use of a metaphor; (d) the description of kings in the ancient Near East by way of animal imagery is not limited to the metaphor of the shepherd, therefore not necessitating the backdrop to this one metaphor (KVANVIG 1988: 499).

2.10. *Vision of the Netherworld*

A hallmark of the research on the background of Dan 7 is often a very complex mixture of different traditions proposed in order to account for all the details of this vision since "no text has been discovered which combines all or most of the features of the vision" (KVANVIG 1981: 85). It was this assessment that **H.S. KVANVIG** challenged, when he claimed in a preliminary report published in 1981 that he had discovered the very text that served as the "real background" of Dan 7, combining "most of the features extant in the vision of Daniel 7" (1981: 85f).⁷⁶ According to KVANVIG the imagery of Dan 7 "is derived from an Akkadian vision of the nether world and closely related traditions" (1988: 346). The text referred to is the "Vision of the Netherworld",⁷⁷ i.e., the Assyrian text VAT 10057, dating from the seventh

⁷⁶ Nevertheless KVANVIG lowered the high expectations raised in his introduction with a disclaimer in the last paragraph of his preliminary publication by stating: "I do not claim that the author of Dan 7 has read the Assyrian vision. The way the parallels occur do rather point towards a knowledge about traditions derived from this unique and strange text in Mesopotamian milieu. Neither do I claim that the Assyrian vision is the only source behind Dan 7. There are certainly others ... But I do think that traditions from the Assyrian vision form the main source of Dan 7" (1981: 88).

⁷⁷ The "Vision of the Netherworld" was first published by EBELING (1931: 1–19). A revised edition was published by VON SODEN (1936), which received only a few changes later by EBELING (1937) and VON SODEN (1938). A new transliteration and translation of lines 42–49 of VON SODEN'S edition was provided by FRANK (1941). English translations of the "Vision of the Netherworld" are found in SPEISER 1969c: 109f, HEIDEL 1949: 132–136, and KVANVIG 1988: 390–399. The content of the "Vision of the Netherworld" is as follows: It opens with the identification of the report as a night-vision or dream. In autobiographical style the visionary describes fifteen hybrid gods of the netherworld, as he starts to recount the content of his dream. The enumeration of these gods follows a new static picture: "One man [*īštēn eṭlu*], his body was black like pitch. His face was similar to that of an Anzu-bird. He was wearing a red robe. In his left hand he was holding up a bow. In his right hand he was hol[d]ing a sword. [With his left foot he was treading on]" (line 50). In a new scene, the visionary watches as the warrior god Nergal is seated on a royal throne to hold judgement over the dreamer, who is brought into the presence of Nergal, who delivers a long speech. In the first part of this speech the visionary is threatened with the death-sentence because he has dishonoured Nergal's wife. However the sentence is finally commuted – due to the intercession of the divine counsellor – into the prospect that the visionary's future will bring disturbance, dishonesty, and rebellion instead of immediate death. The second part of Nergal's speech is introduced with a description of a spirit in the netherworld who is the "exalted shepherd; to whom my father [], the king of the gods, gives/gave full responsibility; whom from sunrise to sunset he allows to look over the lands in their totality [], and he r[ul]es over everything; to [w]hom, in view of his priesthood, Aššur [decr]ees the celebration of the holy New-Years festival in the open country, in the garden of fertility, an image of Lebanon. [] in all eternity" (lines 62B–64). This ideal king is then set in contrast with a rebel king, the father of the visionary. Of both is predicted that they will suffer together because of the crime they committed. As the dreamer awakes he describes his feelings resulting from the just-experienced dream to conclude his account with praises for Nergal and the divine queen. The epilogue tells how the dream changed the scribe's corrupt attitude into the willingness to do all that Nergal commands.

century B.C.E., which is dealt with in detail by KVANVIG in his book *Roots of Apocalyptic* published in 1988. A second Akkadian dream vision, “The Death–Dream of Enkidu,” part of the “Humbaba story” found in the *Gilgamesh* epic,⁷⁸ is also used for comparison with Dan 7. According to KVANVIG (ibid. 354) the “Death–Dream of Enkidu” forms the background of the “Vision of the Netherworld”. However, “even though the vision [of the Netherworld] is dependent upon the Death–Dream [of Enkidu], the motifs are transferred to another setting and used with another intention” (ibid. 439).

KVANVIG made the following comparisons between the “Death–Dream of Enkidu” (=E), the “Vision of the Netherworld” (=K), and Dan 7 (=D): (1) *Gattung*, (2) structure of content, (3) and words and phrases.⁷⁹

- (1) Comparing the three texts in regard to the *Gattung* “vision” (ibid. 443–448) Kvanvig tabulated the correspondences as follows (ibid. 448):

	<i>D</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>E</i>
Basic classification	Night-vision Introduction Opening Scenes (5) Reaction (2x)	Night-vision Introduction Opening Scenes (2) Reaction (2x)	Night-vision Introduction Opening ?
Further classification	Symbolic Throne-scene	Partly symbolic Throne-vision	? Throne-scene
Experience	Vision + audition Action by the visionary (restrained)	Vision + audition Action by the visionary	Vision + audition Action by the visionary (dominating)

⁷⁸ In the Neo-Assyrian version from Kuyuncik the “Death–Dream of Enkidu” is found on tablet VII, column iv, lines 11–54. A translation is found in SPEISER 1969b: 87, tab. 7, col. iv, 11–54). KVANVIG (1988: 355–361) gives a partly new translation which includes newly discovered tablets also containing “The Death–Dream of Enkidu”. The content of “The Death–Dream of Enkidu” is as follows: The introduction informs the reader that Enkidu saw a dream during the night-time. The vision opens by describing the violent reaction of nature as death breaks into the world. In lines 17f the first figure is introduced, “one man” whose “face was similar to that of an Anzu-bird”. He engages Enkidu in a fight, which “is interrupted by a cry from Enkidu to Gilgamesh for help” (ibid. 361). Since Gilgamesh did not come to help, the man is transformed into a bird-like creature. The report continues with a description of the descent to the nether world. On arriving in the nether world Enkidu describes how the royal dwellers of the nether world participate in a banquet. The final section is a further description of dwellers of the nether world over whom the queen of the nether world, Ereshkigal, resides in judgement. The report breaks off with the following two lines (53/54): “Lifting up her [Ereshkigal’s] head, she looked at me [Enkidu]: / Saying: ‘Who has brought this one here?’”

⁷⁹ The parallels put forward by KVANVIG for the structure of content and for words and phrases are separated in this review in so far as those pertaining to the first part of the vision will be discussed in the following paragraphs while those relating to the second part of the vision are listed in the second part of this review on the research history of Dan 7.

Intention	Destruction of another person Religious–political intention	Destruction of the visionary Destruction of another person Religious–political intention	Destruction of the visionary
-----------	--	--	------------------------------

KVANVIG concluded that “the three texts share a basic pattern for visions. They are all night–visions, but besides this they show individual variations. D and K have more in common than D and E” (ibid. 444).

- (2) The comparison of the “structure of content” (ibid. 448–451), relating to the first part of the Danielic vision, resulted in the following comparative table (ibid. 452):

<i>Sequences</i>	<i>Features</i>		
	D	K	E
Action of nature	Winds		Thunder–storm
Monsters	Description of monsters Listing of monsters Transformation	Description of monsters Listing of monsters Transformation Description of the man	Description of monster Description of the netherworld

- (3) The comparison of “words and phrases” (ibid. 451–456) resulted in the following: In regard to the action of the nature (the winds and the sea in Dan 7), KVANVIG (ibid. 451) listed only one parallel, namely, in the Death–Dream of Enkidu (line 15): “The heaven howled, the earth echoed”) but none for the “Vision of the Netherworld”. In regard to the missing motif of the sea KVANVIG argued that:

yam in Dan 7 is ... functionally equivalent to Apsu in several Mesopotamian texts. The ‘sea’ in these cases is the abyss, the abode of monstrous creatures ... But in Dan 7 the monsters do not remain in the nether world, but emerge from below to bring disaster on earth” (ibid. 505f).

For the comparison of the monster–features, KVANVIG (ibid. 455) presented the following comparative table:

	<i>D</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>E</i>
1st monster	lion with eagle–wings lion raised upon two feet upon two feet like a man	lion–eagle lion standing on hind legs feet like a man	lion–eagle lion–eagle standing upright one man
2nd monster	raised on one side ribs in his mouth stand up, devour!	monster missing hind leg grasping the hair of a victim name of monster: hurry, remove!	

3rd monster	four bird–wings four heads	monster with wings monster with two heads	
4th monster	no name of last monster two creatures described terrible and dreadful stamped with its feet ten horns human eyes and a mouth that spoke	no name of last monster last monster composed of two bodies possessing terror and dreadful splendour with its left foot it was treading (horned) crown of last monster second part of last mon- ster: head of a man	

After assessing the parallels of the beasts⁸⁰ between the “Vision of the Netherworld”⁸¹ and the first part of the Danielic vision, KVANVIG concluded that “in our opinion these parallels are so significant that they may indicate a dependence – especially when we take into consideration that they occur in two night–visions with the same sequence of basic content” (ibid. 457).⁸²

⁸⁰ “In the description of the monsters there are so many similarities that we think we can conclude that the texts share the same basic imagery. This, however, does not automatically mean that the texts are related in one way or another. Some features are fairly common in descriptions of monsters in the Ancient Near East ... There are, however, details given in the texts that taken together could point toward a relationship, even though some of them also are represented in other texts ... the parallels between the last–described monster in the two texts are also outstanding ...” (ibid. 457).

⁸¹ In regard to the “Death–Dream of Enkidu” KVANVIG (ibid. 459) concluded that “although there are significant similarities also between the Death–Dream and Dan 7, these do not demonstrate a likely dependence.”

⁸² The following critical remarks against an influence from the “Vision of the Netherworld” have been put forward (cf. also n. 301 on p. 86):

- (1) The “Vision of the Netherworld” has 15 monsters, Dan 7 only 4 (DAY 1985: 159; LUCAS 1990: 169; COLLINS 1993b: 285 = ibid. 1993a: 129);
- (2) The Akkadian text does not have bear or leopard characteristics (DAY 1985: 159; LUCAS 1990: 169; BRYAN 1995: 225);
- (3) The monsters from the nether world are not associated with the sea (DAY 1985: 159; LUCAS 1990: 169; BRYAN 1995: 224);
- (4) The monsters in the Assyrian texts are gods, not beasts that function as symbols of empires (LUCAS 1990: 169; COLLINS 1993b: 285 = ibid. 1993a: 129);
- (5) The claimed similarities between the monsters are either incidental (GOLDINGAY 1988: 151), non–existent, trivial (LUCAS 1990: 170), an exaggeration (COLLINS 1993b: 285, n. 65) or outweighed by the differences (BRYAN 1995: 224) because: (a) features from different gods are combined to furnish parallels to the Danielic beasts (COLLINS 1993b: 285); (b) the monster in line 46 of the Akkadian text that has the head of a lion and the feet of the Zu–bird does not mention wings which is the specific eagle–feature of the first Danielic beast (LUCAS 1990: 169); (c) the monster mentioned in line 48A of the “Vision of the Netherworld” described as missing one leg making it limping if it would stand upright, as parallel to the Danielic bear is “pure supposition and also adopts an unusual interpretation of the meaning of an obscure phrase describing the bear in Daniel” (ibid.); (d) the parallels to the third Dan–

2.11. 'Kosher mentality' influence

While D. BRYAN considered different influences as having had an impact on the first part of the vision of Dan 7,⁸³ he was particularly interested in "the mentality underlying both the adoption of the lion with eagle's wings, the inclusion of the bear, and the creation of the other two *Mischwesen*" (1995: 234).

According to 'kosher mentality' a *Mischwesen* represents an extreme form of uncleanness. Bryan perceived against an underlying 'kosher mentality' in Dan 7:4 "a symbolic movement from *Mischwesen* to 'Unclean Lion' to 'Converted Lion' which corresponds to the transformation of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 3–4" (ibid. 238). First the plucking out of the wings transformed the *Mischwesen* into an unclean lion, i.e., a less unclean form of the lion than the original *Mischwesen*, thereby indicating an earlier phase of Nebuchadnezzar's conversion. The change of the lion's posture into that of a human and the giving of a human heart transformed the unclean lion in a second stage into an acceptable form according to 'kosher mentality'⁸⁴ and therefore is an apt symbol for a converted king acknowledging the Most High (ibid. 23ff).

ielic beast are at best "trivial" (ibid. 170) when citing the following comparative passages from VAT 10057; "The upholder of Evil (had) the head of a bird; his wings were open as he flew to and fro, (his) hands (and) feet were human" (line 45); "All that is Evil (had) two heads; one head was (that of) a lion, the other head [...]" (line 47); (e) the two gods in line 48 of the Akkadian text whose name the visionary does not know are not a parallel to the fourth Danielic beast because the first is compared to a known manifestation, i.e., the Anzu-bird (ibid.); (f) interpreting the crown worn by the second of the two unknown gods as representing a horned head-gear is an assumption (ibid.);

- (6) There is no parallel in the "Vision of the Netherworld" to the winds and the sea of Dan 7 as KVANVIG himself admitted (cf. above p. 25) (COLLINS 1993b: 284 = ibid. 1993a: 129; ibid. 1993b: 291 = ibid. 1993a: 131);
- (7) *Genre*, patterns, and functions are different in the two visions: (a) the Akkadian vision is a *message dream* whereas Dan 7 is a *symbolic dream* (ibid. 1993b: 284 = ibid. 1993a: 129); (b) the pattern of relationships is different: namely, Dan 7 has two opposing parties, VAT 10057 reports no opposition (ibid. 1993b: 285f = ibid. 1993a: 131; ibid. 1993b: 291 = ibid. 1993a: 131); (c) the Danielic text provides reassurance and consolation, the "Vision of the Netherworld" "culminates in renewed piety" (ibid. 1993b: 286 = ibid. 1993a: 131);
- (8) The visionary in VAT 10057 is involved in the action of the dream while Daniel is not (ibid.);
- (9) No destruction of a monster occurs in the Akkadian text (ibid. 1993b: 291 = ibid. 1993a: 131).

⁸³ BRYAN mentioned the following other influences in the first part of Dan 7: (1) the association of lion, bear, and leopard is derived from the Old Testament (1995: 220, 233f) however not their particular form; (2) the winged lion derives from Mesopotamian art (ibid. 222, 234); (3) the vision uses mythological imagery of the Old Testament which in turn is based on Canaanite mythology (ibid. 229–234).

⁸⁴ BRYAN argued that kosher-rules consider animals walking on all fours as being unclean but those using only two legs, such as the hopping locusts and related insects, as being closer to humans and therefore clean or acceptable for consumption (ibid. 141, 235).

Since the bear and leopard are also unclean animals they “embody the powers of chaos which oppose the rule of divine order” (ibid. 237). The fourth beast in Dan 7 is according to BRYAN (ibid. 238) “the unclean beast *par excellence*” which stands in stark contrast to the one “who is like a ‘man’, the archetypal clean land creature” created in the image of God (ibid.).⁸⁵

2.12. Old Testament influence

Influence from the Old Testament⁸⁶ on the first part of the vision of Dan 7 is generally acknowledged by most scholars. However, the use of the biblical passages referred to and – dependent on this – also the degree of their influence on Dan 7, differs among scholars. The following section distinguishes five main uses of Old Testament passages and points out their relevance in the evaluation of Old Testament influence on the first part of the Danielic vision of chapter 7.⁸⁷

2.12.1. The different uses of Old Testament passages

(1) The most basic use of the Old Testament in the study of the vision of Dan 7 is *as reference source without traditio–historical evaluation*. While this type of use is employed by almost all scholars in addition to other uses described below, a few studies on Dan 7 do not go beyond this methodology at all. Besides citing parallels to specific Danielic features, they lack any traditio–historical discussion of the first part of Dan 7. Commentaries that fall in this group include the works of C.F. KEIL (1872), S.R. DRIVER (1900), J.A. MONTGOMERY (1927), J. GOETTSBERGER (1928), R.H. CHARLES (1929), and H.C. LEUPOLD (1969).

(2) In contrast to the previous methodology, supporters of a mythological background for the vision of Dan 7 used these very same Old Testament parallels *as evidence for the transmission (and reflection) of mythological concepts* into biblical tradition and their mediating function for Dan 7. Furthermore, since Dan 7 reflects an imagery and structure similar to the adduced mythologically–coloured biblical tradition, it is argued that Dan 7 should be understood and interpreted along the same line. More or less explicit statements in this regard have been made by

⁸⁵ The following critical remark against an influence from ‘kosher mentality’ has been mentioned: The ‘kosher mentality’ arising from Lev 11 and Deu 14 is not “a precedent for the symbolic use of *Mischwesen* as they appear in Dan 7 (Lucas 2000: 72).

⁸⁶ Apocryphal parallels are frequently cited; however, in the final analyses of the influence from the Old Testament on Dan 7 they remain largely without impact. Some of the most frequent passages referred to are: Ps Sol 2:2, 29, 32, 33; 4 Ezr 6:49, 50; 11:1; 12:10–12; 13:1–3, 5; 2 Bar 29:4; 1 En 60:7; 85–90; 90:9; 1 Mac 1:24; 2 Mac 5:17; Sib Ora III, 388–400.

⁸⁷ The distinguished different uses do not claim to be exhaustive nor a meticulous methodological analysis. In fact many authors used several methods in their discussions which is a reflection of the complexity of the whole chapter which resists a single explanatory pattern. Nevertheless some basic differences can be observed.

GUNKEL,⁸⁸ MARTI,⁸⁹ BENTZEN,⁹⁰ HEATON,⁹¹ EMERTON,⁹² RHODES,⁹³ PORTEOUS,⁹⁴ LACOCQUE,⁹⁵ COLLINS,⁹⁶ KVANVIG,⁹⁷ and GOLDINGAY.⁹⁸ This kind of utilisation of

-
- ⁸⁸ "Welcher Stoff aber Dan 7 zu Grunde liegt, kann nach den bisherigen Ausführungen nicht zweifelhaft sein. Tiere, die aus dem Wasser emporsteigen und gottfeindliche Weltreiche bedeuten, sind uns aus dem Obigen wolbekannt (*sic*). Dan 7 ist mit Jes 307 Ez 29 32 *Ψ* 6831 874 Jes 271 *Ψ* 74 *Ψ* Sal 2 aufs nächste verwandt und daher auch ebenso wie diese Stellen zu beurteilen. Nun ist oben gezeigt worden, dass diese Stücke den babylonischen Chaosmythus enthalten, der eine Weissagung geworden war und herkömmlich auf den politischen Feind gedeutet wurde. Dasselbe gilt also auch für Daniel 7" (GUNKEL 1895: 328; cf. also p. 334).
- ⁸⁹ "Wie bei den geschichtlichen Darstellungen, so schöpft der Verf. auch hier aus der alten Überlieferung. Sah ein Dtjes in den Thaten (*sic*) Gottes bei der Befreiung des Volkes aus Ägypten und beim Kampf der Urzeit mit den Chaosungeheuern einen Beweis der gewaltigen Macht (s. zu Jes 43 19 50 2f. 51 9–11), die Gott in neuen Thaten herrlich bekunden wird, so fand man bald in den Ereignissen jener Zeit die Geschehnisse der Endzeit präfiguriert (s. zu Jes 31 8 37 36), und hier verwendet nun der Verf. die Elemente des alten Schöpfungsmythus zur Schilderung seines Gesichtes von den letzten Zeiten" (MARTI 1901: 48).
- ⁹⁰ "Die Eschatologisierung des Schemas von Psalm 2 haben wir nun im *Traumgesicht Daniels* Dan. 7 ... Das eschatologische Traumgesicht ist jedoch sogar mythologischer als der Psalm ... Im Traumgesicht Daniels beobachten wir ein Beispiel dessen, was wir 'die Renaissance der Mythologie' im späteren Judentum nennen können" (BENTZEN 1948: 72f = *ibid* 1955: 74 = *ibid*. 1970: 74).
- ⁹¹ "Even a cursory reading of Daniel's vision will show that the writer is drawing on the same mythology [i.e., the Babylonian Epic of Creation] as Psa. 74 and 89" (HEATON 1956: 171).
- ⁹² "It has often been suggested that there is a connection between this chapter and the Babylonian myth of Tiamat, the monster of the watery chaos who is slain by Marduk. But it would probably be a mistake to think simply of direct Babylonian influence on Daniel. The O.T. has a number of references to a struggle between Yahweh and Rahab or Leviathan, the chaos dragon, and it is therefore probable that any foreign influence was mediated through the O.T. tradition. It is also likely that the foreign source was the religion of Canaan, not Babylon" (EMERTON 1958: 228).
- ⁹³ "When the biblical writers use expressions which had their origin in ancient mythology, those expressions have been run through the 'chemistry' of Israel's faith and have thereby become suitable vehicles for communicating the distinctive, biblical revelation" (RHODES 1961: 417).
- ⁹⁴ "Wir müssen überdies die Bezugnahmen auf den Schöpfungsmythos in Ps. 74,13ff. und Ps. 89,9ff. in Betracht ziehen, in denen Leviathan und Rahab das urzeitliche Ungeheuer der Tiamat des babylonischen Mythos darstellen ... Es ist kaum zu bezweifeln, dass die Mythen und Rituale ... die Quelle der Bilder darstellen, die sich im 7. Kapitel finden ..." (PORTEOUS 1962: 79f).
- ⁹⁵ "The imagery used in the first part of this chapter draws its materials from the ancient cosmologies ... Thus A. Bentzen sees an instance of remythologisation here (of Psa. 2, for example)" (LACOCQUE 1976: 105f = *ibid*. 1979: 138f).
- ⁹⁶ "The vision accounts ... are formulated in traditional language, much of which is drawn ultimately from ancient Near Eastern mythology" (COLLINS 1977: 95); "From the preceding discussion it should be clear that when the apocalyptist in Daniel 7 describes the sea churned up by the winds and four huge beasts coming up out of the sea, he was using traditional imagery. As we have seen, the stormy sea is ubiquitous in the OT as a symbol

the Old Testament considers biblical tradition on the one hand as an important factor in the formulation of Dan 7, while on the other hand very often sidelining its influence because the main emphasis is laid on the mythological imagery that lies behind the biblical tradition rather than on its mediating function.

(3) The use of the Old Testament *as reflector of ancient Near Eastern concepts and symbols in general* was emphasised in particular by JUNKER. While the use of Old Testament parallels described in the previous paragraph emphasises the dependence of Dan 7 on ancient Near Eastern mythology, JUNKER replaced the notion of a mythological origin with the idea of a more *general influence from ancient Near Eastern concepts*.⁹⁹ Thus a consistent feature of JUNKER'S discussion is the rejection of a mythological origin and at the same time the emphasis of a more general ancient Near Eastern conceptual and symbolic background of Dan 7.¹⁰⁰

of chaos – an image derived from the Sea, Yamm, of Canaanite myth" (ibid. 99); "... many of the motifs associated with the Ba'al myth were adapted to Israelite religion in the period of the monarchy" (ibid. 1993b: 293 = ibid. 1993a: 134).

⁹⁷ "With regard to the sea and the monsters in Dan 7, we cannot see any particular reason to connect this material directly to Ugaritic myths. The correspondences to the myth about the slaying of the sea monster are of such a kind that the spread of this myth in Israelite milieu – as attested in the Old Testament – should be sufficient as background" (KVANVIG 1988: 504).

⁹⁸ "Thus it is illuminating to imagine the author of Dan 7 combining the combat as adopted in the OT but also as known in the learned tradition with the four-regimes scheme and the form of the dream from chap. 2 ..." (GOLDINGAY 1988: 152). Cf. also the statement by HOOKER relating to the second part of the vision but expressing a similar sentiment as the above group: "Whether or not such a [enthronement] festival ever existed, the evidence which its advocates have brought forward shows that the myth, if not the ritual, had been absorbed into Hebrew thought. While Daniel may possibly have been influenced by foreign cults, he did not introduce anything which was alien to Hebrew tradition: the motifs which he employs already have their place in the life of the nation" (1967: 18; cf. also pp. 20, 23).

⁹⁹ JUNKER stated his own position by attributing it – in a slightly overstressed statement – also to GUNKEL: "Wenn auch Gunkels Auffassung in der Herleitung der Vision aus dem Chaosmythus einseitige, heute von ihm selbst aufgegebene Übertreibung ist, so hat er doch das Verdienst, innerhalb der Kritik den Weg frei gemacht zu haben für eine unbefangene Würdigung des Alters der Vision. Auch methodisch hat er den richtigen Weg gewiesen, indem er die Vision nicht als künstliches, rein literarisches Produkt auffasst, sondern sie aus der *Vorstellungswelt und den Symbolen den Alten Orients* [my emphasis], aus der ja auch die babylonischen Mythen gestaltet sind, zu verstehen suchte" (1932: 33).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. the following statements: "Das Meer erscheint in der *allgemeinen orientalischen Vorstellung* [my emphasis] als ein feindliches zerstörendes Element" (ibid. 34); "Auch die vier Winde ... sind kosmische Elemente, die eine ähnliche *symbolische* [my emphasis; JUNKER avoids the term 'mythological'] Bedeutung haben wie das Meer" (ibid. 35); "Die Darstellung der feindlichen Mächte durch wilde schreckliche Tiere ist zwar ein in den mythologischen Erzählungen häufig wiederkehrender Zug, aber doch kein ausschliesslich mythologisches Motiv, sondern weit verbreitet in der *altorientalischen Kunst und Literatur* [my emphasis]" (ibid.); "Selbst wenn das Motiv [of hostile nations represented by beasts] ursprünglich aus der Mythologie stammt, so ist es doch im Laufe der Zeit zur *abgeblassten literarischen Form* [my emphasis] geworden, die man nicht mehr als mythologisch im eigentlichen Sinne bezeichnen kann" (ibid.); "Die Vision verwendet

(4) A considerable number of scholars assessed Old Testament parallels *as evidence of a "demonstrably biblical pedigree"*¹⁰¹ for the first part of the vision of Dan 7. The following can be mentioned in this regard: JUNKER,¹⁰² M.A. BEEK,¹⁰³ BENTZEN,¹⁰⁴ BAUMGARTNER,¹⁰⁵ PLÖGER,¹⁰⁶ COLLINS,¹⁰⁷ HARTMAN/DI LELLA,¹⁰⁸ DAY,¹⁰⁹ MOSCA,¹¹⁰ J. DOUKHAN,¹¹¹ and LUCAS.¹¹²

hier [speaking of the four-headed leopard] ganz frei *allgemeine Motive* [my emphasis] aus der religiösen Kunst des Orients zu symbolischen Zwecken" (ibid. 42).

¹⁰¹ To use MOSCA's (1986: 500) terminology.

¹⁰² "Entscheidend ist aber, dass die Zusammenstellung: Löwe, Bär, Leopard sich rein literarisch ohne jedes mythologische Motiv leicht erklärt. Man beachte nur einmal die verschiedenen Stellen des A.T., an denen gefährliche Raubtiere zusammengestellt werden ..." (JUNKER 1932: 37).

¹⁰³ "Wir treffen aber das Nebeneinander von Löwe, Bär und Panther öfters im AT und das kann uns vielleicht auf die richtige Spur bringen und uns davor warnen, einen zu tiefen Grund für das Vorkommen dieser Tiere zu suchen" (BEEK 1935: 8f).

¹⁰⁴ "Indes lassen sich die Raubtiergestalten bei dem jüdischen Verfasser zur Not auch allein auf dem AT heraus verstehen" (BENTZEN 1937: 32 = ibid. 1952: 59).

¹⁰⁵ "Andererseits kommt der Bär im AT öfter mit dem Löwen, wie auch dem Wolf und Panther zusammen vor. So wird Junker recht haben: der Apokalyptiker nennt die drei gefährlichsten Raubtiere, die Israel kennt, und zeichnet das erste und dritte in der beliebten alto-orientalischen-mythischen Form" (BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f).

¹⁰⁶ "Die ausschliessliche Herleitung dieses Teils der Vision [speaking of the four beasts] aus dem alttestamentlichen Bereich wird sicher einseitig sein, aber sie beherrscht doch die Zeichnung, und Entlehnungen sind eher unbewusst geschehen als eine wirkliche Übernahme fremder Vorstellungen" (PLÖGER 1965: 110).

¹⁰⁷ "The fact that the beasts in Dan 7 represent kingdoms may reflect the traditional Hebrew and Ugaritic use of the names of male animals to designate nobility. The specific list of beasts in this vision finds its closest parallel in Hosea 13:7 ..." (COLLINS 1977: 104); "The sea and the beasts in Daniel 7 might be derived and understood adequately from the scattered references to this imagery in the Hebrew bible (ibid. 99); "The specific descriptions of the beasts are not drawn from any known variant of the *Chaoskampf*. Perhaps the most popular suggestion has looked to Hos 13:7-8, where God threatens that he will be to Israel like a lion, a leopard, a bear, or a 'wild beast'" (ibid. 1984: 80); "A more plausible background [for the four beasts] is found in biblical prophecy. Lion, bear, and leopard are mentioned in Hos 13:7-8 in the context of a divine threat ... This passage is the closest parallel we have to the sequence of animals in Daniel 7, although the order of the second and third is reversed. Mention of an unidentified wild beast also provides a possible parallel to the fourth beast of Daniel ..." (ibid. 1993b: 295).

¹⁰⁸ HARTMAN/DI LELLA (1978: 212), although considering the four beast as "*ad hoc* creation of the author" (cf. also REID 1989: 84), pointed out that "there is no need here to look for any direct borrowing from ancient mythological literature, such as the Babylonian epic *Enuma Elish*. Our author could easily have derived his idea of monsters coming up out of the sea from the Bible ...".

¹⁰⁹ "The most attractive view is that the four beasts of Dan. 7 owe their fundamental derivation to Hos. 13:7-8 ..." (DAY 1985: 156; cf. also p. 157).

¹¹⁰ MOSCA (1986: 500) listed the following parallels for the first part of Dan 7: (1) the "great sea" as symbol of chaos; (2) the "winds of heaven" stirring up the sea; (3) the "great sea" as a spawning ground of Yahweh's enemies; (4) the description of the fourth beast; (5) the association of horns with kingship and/or might; (6) the arrogant speech that leads to

(5) Taking into account the role of the Old Testament as outlined above and as reflected in the following tabulation of the most cited Old Testament parallels (cf. p. 35), as well as the fact that even advocates of a mythological origin of Dan 7 refrained from claiming that there is a direct link between Dan 7¹¹³ and the adduced mythological background,¹¹⁴ one would deem it only logical to investigate whether

judgement. The Old Testament parallels for the second part of the vision include: (1) the heavenly court and positioning of thrones; (2) the “Ancient of days”; (3) the whiteness of snow and the purity of wool; (4) the wheeled throne with fiery flames; (5) the angelic attendants; (6) the heavenly books; (7) the fate of the fourth beast; (8) the idiom “son of man”; (9) the “clouds of heaven”; (10) the granting of universal and everlasting kingship (ibid. 500f).

¹¹¹ DOUKHAN (1989: 154, n. 32) followed HARTMAN/DI LELLA (cf. above n. 108).

¹¹² “Overall, we would agree with Day’s conclusion that, ‘the fundamental basis for the four types of beast is drawn from Hos. 13:7–8, with some influence from ancient near-eastern *Mischwesen*’” (LUCAS 1990: 183).

¹¹³ A notable exception is KVANVIG according to COLLINS (1993b: 281, n. 39); but cf. above n. 76 on p. 23.

¹¹⁴ Although this is true, explicit statements in this regard were rather scanty (cf. e.g. the statements by GUNKEL: “Er [the author of Dan 7] hat nicht als der Erste den Chaos-Mythus als Weissagung gefasst; vielmehr waren ihm darin schon viele Geschlechter vorangegangen. Der Verfasser hat den Mythus in dieser Form bereits überkommen; und es ist durchaus nicht selbstverständlich, dass der seinen ursprünglichen Sinn noch gekannt habe” [1895: 334]; EMERTON: “The O.T. has a number of references to a struggle between Yahwe and Rahab or Leviathan, the chaos dragon, and it is, therefore, probable that any foreign influence was mediated through the O.T. tradition” [1958: 228]; COLPE: “Die ugaritischen Texte repräsentieren jedoch nicht genau die Mythologie, die in Palästina geglaubt wurde” [1969: 421]). However FERCH’S (1980) criticism of the Canaanite school sparked more clearly-formulated statements, particularly from COLLINS (lately also very well summarised by BAUER 1996: 141–144). On the one hand COLLINS (1981: 91–93; cf. also DAY 1985: 164) is correct that FERCH overlooked in his criticism of the Ugaritic background of Dan 7 that there is no explicit claim of direct linkage (cf. previous paragraph), on the other hand it has to be pointed out that the advocates of a mythological background of Dan 7 often over-emphasised the mythological aspect, thereby sidelining the issue that one should not assume any direct link to a specific ancient Near Eastern myth. COLLINS (1981: 91) was correct in stating that “no scholar has ever denied that there is ‘discontinuity’ between Dan 7 and Ugarit” but it seems also to be true that the emphasis on the role of the biblical tradition was neglected in the pursuit of establishing links between Dan 7 and ancient Near Eastern myths. It is only with COLLINS’ article on mythic allusions in Daniel that we now encounter explicit statements in this regard. Cf. the following statements by COLLINS: “It is not, however, claimed that the author of Daniel had before him the exact Ugaritic text which we now possess ... It is highly unlikely that the exact variant of the Ugaritic myth which was discovered by chance in the twentieth century was known to the author of Daniel. The significance of the Ugaritic myths for Daniel, then, is not that they provide the immediate source but that they give an example of traditional usage which illustrates the allusive context of the imagery” (ibid. 90f); “The [biblical] tradition [of God subduing the monsters Rahab and Leviathan] is ultimately of Canaanite origin, but the symbolism of the sea is familiar from the Hebrew Bible, and does not in itself require direct acquaintance with the Canaanite sources” (ibid. 1993a: 126; cf. ibid. 1993b: 289); “Most theories about the religio-historical background of Daniel do not claim to have identified a specific text on which

the Old Testament had an even more prominent position in the formulation of Dan 7.

While the advocates of a general biblical influence on Dan 7 acknowledge a distant mythological connection, they contend that it is much more likely that the closer biblical tradition was ultimately the main influence on the formulation of Dan 7 instead of the mythological concepts that underlie the biblical tradition.¹¹⁵

Two studies with a more coherent perspective of Old Testament influence on Dan 7 have recently been put forward. The first to be mentioned is MOSCA'S (1986: 498) essay that, apart from pointing to a widespread dependence on the Old Testament (cf. n. 110 on p. 31), addressed mainly the issue that the time gap be-

the author of Daniel drew. For Gunkel, the *Enūma eliš* was the source of the tradition of the *Chaoskampf*, not necessarily the immediate prototype of Dan 7" (ibid. 281); "No one would argue that the extant Ugaritic texts were the actual sources on which the author of Dan 7 drew" (ibid. 291); "We must allow, however, that whoever composed Dan 7 was a creative author, not a mere copyist of ancient sources. It should be not surprise that his composition is a new entity, discontinuous in some respects with all its sources" (ibid. 1993a: 124f = ibid. 1993b: 281f); "It must be emphasized that no one suggests that the author of Daniel knew this myth in the precise formulation found at Ugarit ... the myth of Baal and Yam is one formulation of a traditional narrative presupposed in Daniel 7, and can throw light on the choice of imagery and structure of relationships in the biblical text" (ibid. 1993a: 125; cf. the slightly different phrasing in ibid. 1993b: 286). Apart from the lack of clear statements in regard to the role of the adduced mythological material, the term "myth" itself led to considerable misunderstanding and overemphasis of the mythological aspect. Cf. in this regard COLLINS' statement that "in Danielic scholarship the term 'myth' has usually been introduced with reference to the derivation of traditional imagery ... It may, in fact, be better to speak of traditional imagery and avoid the controversial category 'myth'" (1981: 90).

¹¹⁵ Cf. e.g. M. CASEY (1979: 18): "In the OT the sea is used to symbolize the turbulent world and peoples ... More than that, the sea has mythological overtones ... If Babylonian material lies behind this, it is a long way behind. Nearer at hand are the Ugaritic texts ... Above all, clear evidence of this way of thought occurs in the OT ... If we consider this now ... it means that in using the sea as a symbol of hostility to God he was drawing on native Israelite imagery, as a conservative defender of the traditional faith might be expected to ... The winds are the four cardinal winds. It is not surprising that they are found in the Babylonian epic of creation, but it is more relevant that they were already in use in Israel ...". Similar to this statement is the position of BALDWIN (1978: 136) although less explicit: "The attempt will be made in expounding these visions to show that they are not without their connections with the rest of the Old Testament, and that it is these connections which provide the original material out of which the visions have grown. That does not mean that the possibility of foreign borrowing is ruled out ...". Lately BAUER put forward a balanced assessment when he stated: "Die Vision von den vier Tieren, die aus dem von den vier Winden aufgewühlten Meer emporsteigen, hat eine lange Traditionsgeschichte und fusst ursprünglich auf Mythen des Vorderen Orients, in denen vom Kampf Gottes gegen die Chaoswasser des Meeres erzählt wird. Diese alten Mythen haben ihren Niederschlag auch an anderen Stellen des Alten Testaments gefunden ... Noch einmal: Natürlich wollten die Verfasser des Buches Daniel nicht sagen, es sei Baal, von dem sie sich Rettung versprochen. Sie schöpften diese Bilder aus den biblischen Überlieferungen ihres Volkes, und wahrscheinlich wussten sie schon gar nicht mehr, wo diese ursprünglich herkommen." [my emphasis] (1996: 141, 160, cf. also especially pp. 141–144 with a section on the use of religio-historical parallels).

tween the Ugaritic material and the composition of Dan 7 has not been bridged satisfactorily in regard to the motif of the “son of man”. The missing link in this regard is, according to MOSCA (ibid. 508–517), Psa 89 and 8. But far from discussing only this Danielic motif from the perspective of Psa 89 and 8, MOSCA developed a general pattern from these Psalms that serves as the immediate background for the whole vision of Dan 7. Since MOSCA’s main argument concerns the second part of the vision of Dan 7, his article will be dealt with in the second part of this research history (cf. p. 96).

Recently **E. HAAG** introduced a literary, form–historical, and traditio–historical investigation of Dan 7 with the following two questions that lie at the heart of the issue under discussion:

Lässt sich für das in Daniel 7 dargestellte Visionsgeschehen und seine Interpretation eine Verwurzelung in der alttestamentlichen Tradition wahrscheinlich machen? Oder bedarf es hierzu des Rückgriffs auf die Religionsgeschichte, speziell auf die altorientalische Mythologie? (1993a: 137)

These questions were answered in HAAG’S (ibid. 158–185) traditio–historical treatment of Dan 7, which is subdivided into a semantic analysis and a theological synthesis. Although HAAG acknowledged in his semantic analysis the distant mythological background of the motif of the four winds and the stirred–up great sea, he clearly maintained that the Old Testament has to be considered ultimately as the main formative factor of Dan 7 (ibid. 158f).

The “four winds” (Dan 7:2) together with the “clouds of heaven” (Dan 7:13) have to be understood against the Old Testament background as concomitant circumstances of a theophany.¹¹⁶ The “great sea” was also interpreted by HAAG on the one hand as an image for God’s creative sovereignty over the primeval waters,¹¹⁷ and on the other hand as a symbol for the destructive forces in history.¹¹⁸ While HAAG acknowledged mythological overtones in the motifs of the wind and sea, he maintained that the four beasts are not derived from ancient Near Eastern mythological traditions at all (ibid. 160), but are to be understood solely from biblical tradition. The backdrop for the imagery is the biblical tradition that God uses foreign nations (represented by fearful animals) to execute his judgements in the process of his salvific–historical revelation.¹¹⁹ The composite nature of the animals was interpreted by HAAG (ibid. 161f) as a deliberate creation of the author, combining various prophetic symbols to characterise the different ancient empires,¹²⁰ rather than an attempt by the author to use iconographic material to symbolise these empires. In conclusion HAAG (ibid. 163) stated:

¹¹⁶ Jer 49:36; Eze 37:9; Zec 2:10; 6:5.

¹¹⁷ Gen 1:2, 6, 7, 9; Isa 17:12–14; Psa 46:4; 93:3, 4.

¹¹⁸ Gen 6:13; 7:11; Isa 5:30; 28:18, 19; Jer 6:23.

¹¹⁹ Hos 13:7, 8.

¹²⁰ Lion: Jer 4:6, 7; 50:17; 51:38; 38:40; 49:20; Eze 17:3–15; Hab 1:8; Eze 29:18; Jer 51:25, 26, 41; bear: Amo 3:12; Isa 13:17; 21:2; Jer 51:11, 28; leopard: Isa 41:2, 3; 46:11; 45:1–7; fourth beast: Isa 10:7–11.

Aus alledem ergibt sich der Schluss, dass in der Grundschrift von Daniel 7 die Darstellung von dem Heraufsteigen der vier Tiere aus dem Grossen Meer offenbar auf dem Hintergrund einer Glaubensüberlieferung erfolgt ist, deren Inhalt besagt, dass Gott selbst im Vollzug seiner heilsgeschichtlichen Offenbarung in der Welt eine Dreiergruppe von Herrschaftsträgern mit einem festen Auftrag bestellt und sie anschliessend von einem nicht mehr mit diesem Auftrag versehenen, vierten Herrschaftsträger ablösen lässt.

Based on this semantic analysis, HAAG proceeded to identify three biblical traditions that were employed by the author of Dan 7 in the formulation of his vision: The Zion–David–tradition,¹²¹ the four–empire–tradition,¹²² and the enemy–of–God–tradition.¹²³ Although these traditions will be discussed in more detail only in the second part of the research history (cf. p. 97), it should be pointed out here that HAAG'S study is noteworthy in so far as it attempts to present a coherent case for a general biblical influence on Dan 7.

2.12.2. The most cited Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:2–8

In assessing the influence of the biblical tradition on Dan 7, one cannot overlook the numerous references that were made to it. Although the following most cited Old Testament¹²⁴ parallels to the first part of the Danielic vision obviously cannot by themselves settle the complex issue of the background of Dan 7, the sheer number of the approximately 100 passages should caution against sidelining the influence of the biblical tradition on Dan 7:¹²⁵

¹²¹ As MOSCA so did HAAG (1993a: 177) cite Psa 89 as crucial in this regard.

¹²² Reference is made by HAAG (ibid. 180) to the tradition that God appoints foreign nations to execute his judgements (cf. Isa 5:26–29; 10:5, 6; Jer 1:15; 4:6; 6:1, 22; 25:9; 27; Isa 8:7, 8; 28:15).

¹²³ Adduced in this regard were Isa 10; 14; Eze 38; 39; Zec 12–14 (ibid. 181).

¹²⁴ For apocryphal parallels see n. 86 on p. 27.

¹²⁵ Although the presented bibliographic references were established as carefully as possible I do not claim to have not overlooked some parallels. This is especially the case because not every single article and study of the last 100 years could be indexed, a task which would go beyond the purpose of this review. Nevertheless it is hoped that the result represents a helpful overview of Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:2–8.

The following explanatory remarks are in order:

- (1) The nature of the parallels is not uniform. They include mainly lexical, structural, and traditio–historical parallels. No attempt has been made to classify them into sub-groups.
- (2) Only passages that were cited by at least three different authors were considered.
- (3) In regard to the grouping of bibliographic references under one specific heading it has to be noted that sometimes an overlap occurs, because the same biblical parallel was discussed by scholars under different headings, e.g., the sea monsters were discussed by some under Dan 7:2 (stressing more the aspect of the sea) by others under Dan 7:3 (stressing more the aspect of the monsters). To make the presentation easier to read all bibliographic references that cited biblical parallels containing both the features of sea and monster, irrespective of their interpretation, were placed under Dan 7:3. However, bibliographic references that cited biblical passages dealing only

The four winds (7:2)	
Gen 1:2	GUNKEL 1895: 329; MARTI 1901: 49; STEINMANN 1950: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1960: 85; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 19; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Dan 8:8	CHARLES 1929: 175; YOUNG 1953: 142; JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 416; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 138; CASEY 1979: 18; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; BAUER 1996: 144
Dan 11:4	CHARLES 1929: 175; YOUNG 1953: 142; JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 416; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 138; CASEY 1979: 18; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; BAUER 1996: 144
Zec 2:6	CHARLES 1929: 175; YOUNG 1953: 142; JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 416; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 143; HAMMER 1976: 75; BALDWIN 1978: 138; CASEY 1979: 18; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; LUCAS 2000: 70
Zec 6:5	CHARLES 1929: 175; YOUNG 1953: 142; JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 416; HAMMER 1976: 75; BALDWIN 1978: 138; CASEY 1979: 18; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; KVANVIG 1988: 510; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; BAUER 1996: 144
The great sea (7:2)	
Gen 1:2	HEATON 1956: 174f; JEFFERY 1956: 452; KOCH 1961: 9, n. 2; RHODES 1961: 416; PORTEOUS 1962: 83; PLÖGER 1965: 108; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56

with the sea were grouped under Dan 7:2. Another example of overlap occurs when some scholars stressed the actual wording of the biblical text (dragon in the Nile) while others concentrated on the interpretation (symbol of hostile foreign nations). In this case both bibliographic references were grouped under the verse they referred to, in this specific case to Dan 7:3. This is also the case when the beasts representing hostile foreign nations are not aquatic animals.

- (4) Sometimes the author mentioned only a chapter of a specific biblical book, although he had the specific verse in mind under which it is grouped in the table.
- (5) The following general references to Dan 7 should for the sake of completeness also be mentioned:

Psa 2: BENTZEN 1955: 75f; LACOCQUE 1976: 105f = *ibid.* 1979: 139; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149;

Psa 48: EMERTON 1958: 234; PORTEOUS 1962: 81; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149;

Dan 2: GUNKEL 1895: 333, n. 2; HÖLSCHER 1919: 126; GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53; JUNKER 1932: 36f; BENTZEN 1937: 31 = *ibid.* 1952: 58; JEFFERY 1956: 450, 453; NOTH 1957: 268, 270f; *ibid.* 1969: 24f; PLÖGER 1959: 20–22; RHODES 1961: 420; PORTEOUS 1962: 77, 84; PLÖGER 1965: 105f; NOTH 1969: 24; LACOCQUE 1976: 98, 100, 105 = *ibid.* 1976: 123f, 138; COLLINS 1977: 160; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 208; CASEY 1979: 7–9; GESE 1983: 376; COLLINS 1984: 79; LEBRAM 1984: 83f; TOWNER 1984: 92f; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 19; GOLDINGAY 1988: 160; KVANVIG 1988: 484; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148; LUCAS 1990: 183; KRATZ 1991: 43–55; COLLINS 1993a: 129 = *ibid.* 1993b: 284; *ibid.* 1993a: 133, n. 49 = COLLINS 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); COLLINS 1993b: 277, 297; TENGSTRÖM 1993: 82–93;

Dan 4: LEBRAM 1984: 83f; TOWNER 1984: 92; KRATZ 1991: 43f; COLLINS 1993a: 129 = *ibid.* 1993b: 284; *ibid.* 1993b: 277;

Dan 5: PORTER 1983: 111f; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148; KRATZ 1991: 47;

Dan 8: GUNKEL 1895: 333; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; TOWNER 1984: 92;

Zec 12–14: EMERTON 1958: 234; PORTEOUS 1962: 81; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; HAAG 1993a: 181.

Gen 7:11	JUNKER 1932: 34; JEFFERY 1956: 452; HAMMER 1976: 75; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 18; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56
Job 38:8	GUNKEL 1895: 329; MARTI 1901: 49; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 452; KVANVIG 1988: 503; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149
Psa 46:2, 3	GUNKEL 1895: 328; EMERTON 1958: 234; KOCH 1961: 10; PLÖGER 1965: 108; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; HAAG 1993a: 159, 180; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56
Psa 93:3, 4	PLÖGER 1965: 108; KEARNS 1982: 133, ns. 205f; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; HAAG 1993a: 159, 180; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56
Isa 17:12–14	GUNKEL 1895: 328; MONTGOMERY 1927: 285; JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 175; JEFFERY 1956: 452; EMERTON 1958: 234; RHODES 1961: 417; PORTEOUS 1962: 81, 83; PLÖGER 1965: 108; COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 24; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 144; ZEVIT 1968: 391; LEUPOLD 1969: 284; HAMMER 1976: 75; LACOCQUE 1976: 105, n. 6 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 138, n. 66; COLLINS 1977: 97; BALDWIN 1978: 138; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; CASEY 1979: 18; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 126, n. 19 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 288; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56
Isa 51:10	GUNKEL 1895: 329; MARTI 1901: 49; MONTGOMERY 1927: 285; CHARLES 1929: 175; JUNKER 1932: 34; YOUNG 1953: 142; JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 416; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 18; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Jer 6:23	JEFFERY 1956: 452; RHODES 1961: 417; PORTEOUS 1962: 83; PLÖGER 1965: 108; COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 24; ZEVIT 1968: 391; HAMMER 1976: 75; HAAG 1993a: 159; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56
Jer 46:7, 8	KEIL 1872: 222; MONTGOMERY 1927: 285; HEATON 1956: 175; RHODES 1961: 417; LEUPOLD 1969: 284; LACOCQUE 1976: 105, n. 6 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 138, n. 66; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; CASEY 1979: 18
Amo 7:4	MONTGOMERY 1927: 285; JUNKER 1932: 34; JEFFERY 1956: 452; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 211; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 18; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
The beasts from the sea (7:3)	
Job 7:12	GUNKEL 1895: 329; HEATON 1956: 175; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; KEARNS 1982: 125, n. 158; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Job 9:13	JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 175; HOOKER 1967: 20; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; KEARNS 1982: 127, n. 171; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Job 26:12, 13	EISSFELDT 1932: 29 with n. 1; JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 175; HOOKER 1967: 20; COLLINS 1977: 96 with n. 3; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; KEARNS 1982: 126, n. 166 and 127, n. 171; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; KVANVIG 1988: 503; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (cit. MOSCA 1986: 500f); <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 126, n. 19 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 288; BAUER 1996: 145
Job 41:1	EISSFELDT 1932: 29, n. 1; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 21; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Psa 68:30	GUNKEL 1895: 328f; MONTGOMERY 1927: 286; EISSFELDT 1932: 25; JUNKER 1932: 35; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; HOOKER 1967: 19, n. 1; HAMMER 1976: 75; CASEY 1979: 19; COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280
Psa 74:13–17	GUNKEL 1895: 328f; MARTI 1901: 49; MONTGOMERY 1927: 286; CHARLES 1929: 175; EISSFELDT 1932: 25, 29 with n. 1; JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 170f, 174f; JEFFERY 1956: 452; EMERTON 1958: 234; RHODES 1961: 416; PORTEOUS 1962: 79, 81; HOOKER 1967: 19, n. 1 and p. 20; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 144; HAMMER 1976: 75; COLLINS 1977: 96; CASEY 1979: 18; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; KEARNS 1982: 125, n. 158 and p. 126, n. 168; COLLINS 1984: 77; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280; <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128; <i>ibid.</i> 288; HAAG 1993a: 160, 180; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; BAUER 1996: 141

Psa 80:13	MONTGOMERY 1927: 286; JUNKER 1932: 35; HEATON 1956: 170; CASEY 1979: 19
Psa 87:4	GUNKEL 1895: 328; EISSFELDT 1932: 25, 29, n. 1; JUNKER 1932: 35; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280
Psa 89:9–11	GUNKEL 1895: 329; EISSFELDT 1932: 29 with n. 1; JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 170f, 175; PORTEOUS 1962: 79; HOOKER 1967: 20; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 144; COLLINS 1977: 96; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; CASEY 1979: 18; KEARNS 1982: 127, n. 171; COLLINS 1984: 77; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; <i>ibid.</i> 508–515; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 126, n. 19 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 288; <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); HAAG 1993a: 180; BAUER 1996: 145
Psa 104:25, 26	JUNKER 1932: 34; HEATON 1956: 175; JEFFERY 1956: 452; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 144; CASEY 1979: 18
Isa 27:1	GUNKEL 1895: 328f; MARTI 1901: 49; MONTGOMERY 1927: 286; CHARLES 1929: 175; EISSFELDT 1932: 25f, 29; YOUNG 1953: 143; JEFFERY 1956: 453; EMERTON 1958: 227, n. 3; RHODES 1961: 416; HEATON 1956: 175; HOOKER 1967: 20; DELCOR 1968: 295; <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 144; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139; COLLINS 1977: 97; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; CASEY 1979: 18; KEARNS 1982: 125, n. 158 and 126, ns. 163, 166; DAY 1985: 157; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; KVANVIG 1988: 504; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280; <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 288, 295; HAAG 1993a: 160; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; Bauer 1996: 141
Isa 51:9, 11	MARTI 1901: 48; EISSFELDT 1932: 29 with n. 1; JUNKER 1932: 34f; YOUNG 1953: 143; HEATON 1956: 174; HOOKER 1967: 20; COLLINS 1977: 97; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; CASEY 1979: 18; KEARNS 1982: 125, n. 158 and 127, n. 171; COLLINS 1984: 77; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 126, n. 19 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 288; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 295; HAAG 1993a: 160; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 56; BAUER 1996: 144
Eze 29:3	GUNKEL 1895: 328f; MONTGOMERY 1927: 286; EISSFELDT 1932: 29, n. 1; YOUNG 1953: 143; HEATON 1956: 175; JEFFERY 1956: 453; EMERTON 1958: 234; RHODES 1961: 417; PORTEOUS 1962: 81; HOOKER 1967: 19f, n. 1; HAMMER 1976: 75; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139; CASEY 1979: 19; KVANVIG 1988: 504; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280
Eze 32:2–8	GUNKEL 1895: 328f; MARTI 1901: 49; EISSFELDT 1932: 27, 29, n. 1; HEATON 1956: 175; JEFFERY 1956: 453; KVANVIG 1988: 504; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 20; COLLINS 1993a: 121 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 280; <i>ibid.</i> 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Eze 38	EMERTON 1958: 234; PORTEOUS 1962: 81; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; HAAG 1993a: 181
Eze 39	JUNKER 1932: 35; EMERTON 1958: 234; PORTEOUS 1962: 81; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; HAAG 1993a: 181
Zec 2:1–4	GUNKEL 1895: 333; VON RAD 1965: 312; PORTER 1983: 66
The first beast: lion with eagle's wings (7:4)	
1 Sa 17:34–37	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); LUCAS 1990: 182
Pro 28:15	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); LUCAS 1990: 182
Sol 4:8	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37)
Isa 11:6, 7	JUNKER 1932: 37; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1

Jer 4:6, 7	CHARLES 1929: 176; YOUNG 1953: 143; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; COPPENS 1968: 501 n. 25; HAMMER 1976: 76; LACOCQUE 1976: 106, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 72; CASEY 1979: 19f; GOLDINGAY 1988: 161; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33; BAUER 1996: 147
Jer 5:6	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); CASEY 1979: 19; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148; COLLINS 1993b: 295, n. 154; HAAG 1993b: 57
Jer 49:19–22	DRIVER 1900: 81; GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53; CHARLES 1929: 176; YOUNG 1953: 143; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; DELCOR 1968: 298; LEUPOLD 1969: 289; HAMMER 1976: 76; LACOCQUE 1976: 106, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 72; BALDWIN 1978: 139; CASEY 1979: 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148, 161; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33
Jer 50:17	GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53; CHARLES 1929: 176; YOUNG 1953: 143; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; LEUPOLD 1969: 289; HAMMER 1976: 76; LACOCQUE 1976: 106, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 72; CASEY 1979: 20; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33; BAUER 1996: 147
Lam 3:10	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); HAAG 1993b: 57
Lam 4:19	DRIVER 1900: 81; YOUNG 1953: 143; CASEY 1979: 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 161; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33
Eze 1:10	BENTZEN 1952: 59 = <i>ibid.</i> 1937: 31; RHODES 1961: 417; BALZ 1968: 85; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149
Eze 17:3	DRIVER 1900: 81; CHARLES 1929: 176; YOUNG 1953: 143; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; PORTEOUS 1962: 85; LEUPOLD 1969: 289; HAMMER 1976: 76; LACOCQUE 1976: 106, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 72; CASEY 1979: 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33; BAUER 1996: 147
Dan 2:32, 37, 38	DRIVER 1900: 81; MARTI 1901: 49; CHARLES 1929: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 453; RHODES 1961: 417; LACOCQUE 1976: 98 = <i>ibid.</i> 1976: 123; TOWNER 1984: 93; KVANVIG 1988: 484, 487; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148, 162
Dan 4	DRIVER 1900: 81; MARTI 1901: 49; MONTGOMERY 1927: 287; GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53f; JUNKER 1932: 39; BENTZEN 1937: 32 = <i>ibid.</i> 1952: 60; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 417; LACOCQUE 1976: 98 = <i>ibid.</i> 1976: 123; BALDWIN 1978: 139; CASEY 1979: 20; PORTER 1983: 111f; KVANVIG 1988: 484; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148, 162; COLLINS 1993b: 297; HAAG 1993b: 57; BAUER 1996: 147
Hos 13:7, 8	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); HAMMER 1976: 75; LACOCQUE 1979: 139, n. 76; DAY 1985: 156; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148; LUCAS 1990: 182f; COLLINS 1993b: 295; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BAUER 1996: 145; LUCAS 2000: 68
Amo 5:19	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); LUCAS 1990: 182; HAAG 1993b: 57
Hab 1:8	DRIVER 1900: 81; CHARLES 1929: 176; YOUNG 1953: 143; HEATON 1956: 176; RHODES 1961: 417; PORTEOUS 1962: 85; LACOCQUE 1976: 106, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 72; CASEY 1979: 20; GOLDINGAY 1988: 161; COLLINS 1993b: 297f; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BRYAN 1995: 219, n. 33
The second beast: bear (7:5)	
1 Sa 17:34–37	DRIVER 1900: 82; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; LEUPOLD 1969: 290; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297, n. 178
2 Ki 2:24	DRIVER 1900: 82; RHODES 1961: 418; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; COLLINS 1993b: 297

Pro 17:12	JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162
Pro 28:15	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); YOUNG 1953: 144; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; LEUPOLD 1969: 290; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; LUCAS 1990: 182
Isa 11:6, 7	JUNKER 1932: 37; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; COLLINS 1993b: 297, ns. 178, 180
Isa 13:17, 18	MARTI 1901: 50; DRIVER 1900: 82; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; CHARLES 1929: 178; JEFFERY 1956: 454; HEATON 1956: 177; RHODES 1961: 419; PORTEOUS 1962: 86; COPPENS 1968: 501, n. 25; LACOCQUE 1976: 99, 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 123, 140; HAAG 1993a: 162; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; LUCAS 1990: 182
Isa 21:2	DRIVER 1900: 82; PORTEOUS 1962: 86; COPPENS 1968: 501, n. 25; LACOCQUE 1976: 99, 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 123, 140; LUCAS 1990: 182; HAAG 1993a: 162; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57
Isa 51:11	DRIVER 1900: 82; MARTI 1901: 50; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; CHARLES 1929: 178; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; LACOCQUE 1976: 99 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 123; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 298; HAAG 1993a: 162; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57
Isa 51:28	DRIVER 1900: 82; MARTI 1901: 50; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; CHARLES 1929: 178; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; LACOCQUE 1976: 99 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 123; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 298; HAAG 1993a: 162; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57
Lam 3:10	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; HAAG 1993b: 57
Dan 2:32, 39	DRIVER 1900: 82; CHARLES 1929: 177; HEATON 1956: 176; RHODES 1961: 418; TOWNER 1984: 93
Hos 13:7, 8	DRIVER 1900: 82; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); YOUNG 1953: 144; HEATON 1956: 176; LEUPOLD 1969: 290; HAMMER 1976: 75; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 140; <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 139, n. 76; DAY 1985: 156; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148; LUCAS 1990: 182f; COLLINS 1993b: 295; HAAG 1993a: 161; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; COLLINS 1993b: 297, n. 178; BAUER 1996: 145
Amo 3:12, 13	KEIL 1872: 226; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; LEUPOLD 1969: 290; DELCOR 1971: 147; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; COLLINS 1993b: 297, n. 178; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 140
Amo 5:19	DRIVER 1900: 82; MONTGOMERY 1927: 288; JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f; YOUNG 1953: 144; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 418; LACOCQUE 1976: 106 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 140; GOLDINGAY 1988: 162; LUCAS 1990: 182; COLLINS 1993b: 297, n. 178; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57
The third beast: leopard with four wings and four heads (7:6)	
Sol 4:8	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; GOLDINGAY 1988: 163
Isa 11:6, 7	JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; GOLDINGAY 1988: 163
Isa 41:2, 3	MONTGOMERY 1927: 289; HEATON 1956: 177; PORTEOUS 1962: 86; DELCOR 1971: 147; GOLDINGAY 1988: 163; COLLINS 1993b: 298; HAAG 1993a: 162; <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 57; BAUER 1996: 147
Jer 5:6	DRIVER 1900: 83; MONTGOMERY 1927: 289; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); YOUNG 1953: 146; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; LEUPOLD 1969: 293; DELCOR 1971: 147; LACOCQUE 1976: 107, n. 4 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 140, n. 83; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148, 163; COLLINS 1993b: 295, n. 154; HAAG 1993b: 57

Eze 1	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; STEINMANN 1950: 109 = ibid. 1960: 87; PLÖGER 1965: 109; BALZ 1967: 85; GOLDINGAY 1988: 163; COLLINS 1993b: 298
Dan 2:39	KEIL 1872: 228; DRIVER 1900: 83; MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; CHARLES 1929: 178; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 455; TOWNER 1984: 93; COLLINS 1993b: 298
Dan 11:2, 3	MARTI 1901: 50; GOETTSBERGER 1928: 54; BENTZEN 1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61; JEFFERY 1956: 455; RHODES 1961: 419; LACOCQUE 1976: 107, n. 8 = ibid. 1979: 140, n. 87; GOLDINGAY 1988: 163; BAUER 1996: 147
Hos 13:7, 8	DRIVER 1900: 83; MONTGOMERY 1927: 289; JUNKER 1932: 37; BEEK 1935: 9, n. 1; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f (citing JUNKER 1932: 37); YOUNG 1953: 146; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; LEUPOLD 1969: 293; DELCOR 1971: 147; HAMMER 1976: 75; LACOCQUE 1976: 107, n. 4 = ibid. 1979: 140, n. 83; ibid. 1979: 139, n. 76; DAY 1985: 156; GOLDINGAY 1988: 148, 163; LUCAS 1990: 182f; COLLINS 1993b: 295; HAAG 1993a: 161; ibid. 1993b: 57; BAUER 1996: 145
Hab 1:8	DRIVER 1900: 83; JEFFERY 1956: 454; RHODES 1961: 419; LEUPOLD 1969: 293; BALDWIN 1978: 139; BAUER 1996: 151
The fourth beast (7:7)	
Dan 2:40	DRIVER 1900: 84; MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 455; LACOCQUE 1976: 107, n. 8 = ibid. 1979: 140, n. 87; TOWNER 1984: 93; COLLINS 1993b: 299
The horns of the fourth beast (7:8)	
Deu 33:17	DRIVER 1900: 84; YOUNG 1953: 147; JEFFERY 1956: 456; RHODES 1961: 420
1 Sam 2:1, 10	MORENZ 1951: 152, n. 3; YOUNG 1953: 147; DELCOR 1971: 148; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 22; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = ibid. 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Psa 18:3	MORENZ 1951: 152; YOUNG 1953: 147; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 22; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = ibid. 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Psa 75:4–6, 10	JEFFERY 1956: 456; RHODES 1961: 420; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 22; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = ibid. 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Dan 8:3–9, 20–25	DRIVER 1900: 84; HÖLSCHER 1919: 121; BAUMGARTNER 1926: 20; CHARLES 1929: 179; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 456; RHODES 1961: 420; LACOCQUE 1976: 107 = ibid. 1979: 141
Dan 11:21	CHARLES 1929: 179; HEATON 1956: 177; BICKERMANN 1967: 103; LACOCQUE 1976: 99 = ibid. 1976: 123; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Zec 2:1–4	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; MORENZ 1951: 152; JEFFERY 1956: 456; BICKERMANN 1967: 103; ZEVIT 1968: 392, n. 32; BALDWIN 1978: 140; COLLINS 1993b: 299; PORTER 1983: 63–66; BAUER 1996: 152
The eyes of the little horn of the fourth beast (7:8)	
Psa 101:5	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; JEFFERY 1956: 456; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Isa 2:11	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 456; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 141; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Isa 5:15	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Dan 8:23	HEATON 1956: 177; RHODES 1961: 420; PORTEOUS 1962: 87; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 141
The mouth of the little horn of the fourth beast speaking great things (7:8)	
Psa 12:3, 4	DRIVER 1900: 84; MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; CHARLES 1929: 180; YOUNG 1953: 148; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 456; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 141; BALDWIN 1978: 140; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Isa 10:7–12	MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 23; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = ibid. 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; HAAG 1993a: 162, 180f; ibid. 1993b: 58

Isa 14:4–23	MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 23; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f); HAAG 1993a: 181
Isa 37:23	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; JEFFERY 1956: 456; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299; cf. also EISSFELDT 1932: 27
Eze 28:2–10	MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 23; COLLINS 1993a: 133, n. 49 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 292, n. 128 (citing MOSCA 1986: 500f)
Eze 29:3	GUNKEL 1895: 329; EISSFELDT 1932: 27; LACOCQUE 1976: 108, n. 3 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 141, n. 93
Dan 11:36	DRIVER 1900: 84; HÖLSCHER 1919: 121; BAUMGARTNER 1926: 20; CHARLES 1929: 180; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 456; RHODES 1961: 420; PORTEOUS 1962: 87; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 141; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299
Oba 12	MONTGOMERY 1927: 290; CHARLES 1929: 180; YOUNG 1953: 148; HEATON 1956: 177; JEFFERY 1956: 456; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 299

2.13. Iconographic influence

The first part of the vision of Dan 7 received a mixed treatment in regard to the influence of ancient Near Eastern iconography. Thus on the one hand some elements of Dan 7 were not discussed at all, e.g., the sea and the four winds, while on the other hand references to the winged lion abound. Likewise the relevance that was attached to iconographic material for the understanding of Dan 7 varied considerably,¹²⁶ resulting in more detailed iconographic explanations which will be dealt with below, as well as a number of rather general statements.¹²⁷

2.13.1. Lion

The artistic background for the motif of the winged lion was, according to MONTGOMERY (1927: 287), first proposed by J.G. HERDER (1744–1803). He traced the winged lion of Dan 7 back to wall sculptures at Persepolis.¹²⁸ While most

¹²⁶ Cf. such contrasting treatments as COLPE'S (1969: 423) minimal approach which only involved a footnote reference to NOTH'S (1957: 267–271) treatment of the issue without any comment and JUNKER'S (1932: 35–43) lengthy discussions.

¹²⁷ They all refer to ancient Near Eastern *Mischwesen* as possible explanation for the descriptions of the Danielic beasts (NOTH 1957: 267, 270; EMERTON 1958: 227; PORTER 1983: 74f; CASEY 1978: 19f; DAY 1985: 157; CRENSHAW 1992: 371). Other general statements to *Mischwesen* or dragons are more specific by mentioning the region of origin, i.e., Babylon (MEYER 1921: 197; BALDWIN 1978: 139), Persia (MEYER 1921: 197; BAUMGARTNER 1926: 22) or Syro-Palestine (COLLINS 1993b: 296). Unique is JUNKER'S (1932: 35) treatment of the motif of a combination of animals to indicate various subdued enemies (cf. the reference to GRESSMANN 1927: no. 31; JASTROW 1912: no. 47). Among the general iconographic statements DRIVER'S (1926: 142) assertion that the contest between "the god of creation and diverse monsters" is a "frequent *motif* of Babylonian art" was only taken up by HEATON (1956: 175). Singular is also KRAELING'S argument that "the fangs and talons of the monster [i.e., the fourth beast of Dan 7] ... are also accentuated in pictorial representations of Tiamat dragons found on Babylonian seals" (1927: 145 with n. 57, citing JEREMIAS 1913: 26f, pls. 15–17).

¹²⁸ This might refer to the *Löwengreif* on a relief on the palace of Darius I (522–486) (cf. SARRE 1922: pl. 16).

discussions of the Danielic description of the winged lion followed the artistic explanation of HERDER, a specific Persian background was adopted only by a few,¹²⁹ although Persian iconographic evidence was used for a more general comparison with the four beasts of Dan 7 at large.¹³⁰ Again, according to MONTGOMERY (1927: 287), it was F. HITZIG (1850: 102) who first proposed in his commentary on Daniel an Assyrian–Babylonian iconographic background for the winged lion.¹³¹ As early as 1835 C. VON Lengerke (1835: 301) referred to monsters with wings in Babylonian art.

Following HITZIG's line further Danielic research referred to the following backgrounds for the winged lion:

(1) *Babylonian* (KEIL 1872: 223; BEHRMANN 1894: 44; MARTI 1901: 49; BENTZEN 1937: 31f = 1952: 59f; HERZFELD 1947: 832; STEINMANN 1950: 105 = *ibid.* 1960: 84f; YOUNG 1954: 35; HEATON 1956: 176; KOCH 1961: 9, 11;

¹²⁹ E.g. STEINMANN (1950: 106 = *ibid.* 1960: 85): "Sur les bas-reliefs du palais de Persépolis, on voyait le grand Roi vaincre le mal. Et pour ce faire, il éventrait un griffon cornu, à tête et à pattes antérieures de lion, à pattes postérieures et à ailes d'aigle et à queue de scorpion." BICKERMANN (1967: 102f) brought the posture of a lion standing on his hind legs in connection with a depiction on a seal of Darius. However BICKERMANN did not specify which Darius he had in mind nor did he give a reference, except the remark that this seal is to be found in the British Museum. Cf. also BAUMGARTNER (1926: 22, n. *) who referred to a *Löwengreif* on a relief from the palace of Darius I (522–486) at Persepolis. Recently COLLINS (1993b: 296) mentioned in connection with the four beasts of Dan 7 a relief from the palace of Darius at Persepolis showing a royal hero–fight with "a lion, a lion monster, and a bull, respectively" (cf. ROOT 1979: pls. 16a, 16b).

¹³⁰ Examples of very general statements regarding a Persian background are: "Ihre [the Danielic four beasts'] Gestalt entspricht den phantastischen Mischwesen, welche die babylonische wie die chetitische Mythologie geschaffen und die Kunst in unzähligen Variationen dargestellt hat, und als auch die persische Skulpturen die Dämonen bilden" (MEYER 1921: 197; cf. also p. 195, n. 1); "Wir kennen solche mischgestaltige Fabelwesen aus der babylonisch–assyrischen und hetitischen Mythologie, und wissen, dass noch die persische Kunst diese Typen zur Darstellung ihrer eigenen Dämonengestalten benützte" (BAUMGARTNER 1926: 22); "Three animals appear among the Persepolis sculptures in the tačara of Darius, four in the Hall of a Hundred Columns of Artaxerxes I, and there, too, the fourth may result merely from the symmetry of the room with four doors that required four pictures. In all cases a hero – not a king – fights the monsters which are represented 'standing like a man on their hindlegs,' and with fore-claws spread out ... The first is a simple lion, the second a bull, the third a griffin with the body of a lion, hind-legs of an eagle, head of a bird of prey, but with bull's ears. The fourth is distinguished from the third only by the horns of a bull and a scorpion's tail ... The authors of the original book of Daniel hardly knew Persepolis, but did know Babylon and Susa, where similar figures in enameled tiles must have adorned the walls, since Achaemenian art is wholly stereotyped" (HERZFELD 1947: 831f).

¹³¹ "Im Uebr.[igen] erinnere man sich der Verbindung des Löwen und Adlers im Cherub, der geflügelten Löwen mit Menschenkopf, die zu Nimrud aufgedrungen worden, und der Ungethüme mit Flügeln auf babylon. Bildwerken" (HITZIG 1850: 102). HITZIG (*ibid.*) underlined this statement by referring to MÜNTER 1827: 98, 139 (correctly it should be p. 138), pl. 1:11–13 which depict cylinder seals with winged human beings and to the discussions in the *Journal de Savants*, Nov. 1849, p. 676 and Jan. 1850, pp. 34f.

PORTEOUS 1962: 85; BICKERMANN 1967: 102; LEUPOLD 1969: 288; TOWNER 1984: 93; ARCHER 1985: 86; BRYAN 1995: 222; BAUER 1996: 149, figs. 21f);

(2) *Assyrian* (BAUMGARTNER 1926: 22; PLÖGER 1965: 108);¹³²

(3) *Babylonian–Assyrian* (GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53; JUNKER 1932: 38; STEINMANN 1950: 105f; PLÖGER 1965: 108 DELCOR 1968: 298 = *ibid.* 1971: 145; COLLINS 1993b: 296).

Another group preferred to mention only in general terms an *ancient Near Eastern* or a *Mesopotamian* artistic background (CHARLES 1929: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 453; NOTH 1957: 267f; RHODES 1961: 417; BICKERMANN 1967: 102f; MAIER 1982: 264; DAY 1985: 155; COLLINS 1993b: 297; BARTELMUS 1993: 292; UEHLINGER 1995: 821).¹³³

Considering the high number of scholars pointing to an iconographic background of the first beast of Dan 7, one would expect a wealth of bibliographic references. A brief survey of the above-mentioned references is, however, a very sobering exercise. Only a very small number of statements are supported by a bibliographic reference.¹³⁴ The vast majority do not mention a single reference to the adduced iconographic material,¹³⁵ while a very small number of statements contain at least some hints as to where to look.¹³⁶

Scrutiny of those statements that have bibliographic references reveals that the Danielic identity of the winged lion was compared with (a) a *Löwengreif*,¹³⁷ (b) a winged *sphinx*,¹³⁸ or (c) a winged *bull sphinx*.¹³⁹ The following elements of the de-

¹³² The exact opposite opinion was voiced by KOCH (1961: 11): “Der Löwengreif in der Vision von den vier Tieren (Kapitel 7) ist gewiss von jeher auf Babylon und nicht auf Assyrien (wo das Motiv in der Kunst eine geringere Rolle spielt) gedeutet worden.”

¹³³ Exceptions are the specific references of KRAELING (1933: 228) to Elam and of BICKERMANN (1967: 103) to Ur. BAUER (1996: 147f, figs. 19f) spoke also in general terms of *Mischwesen* in ancient Near Eastern art and underlined this by two Hittite winged lions with a second human head.

¹³⁴ HITZIG 1850: 102; BEHRMANN 1894: 44; BAUMGARTNER 1926: 22; *ibid.* 1939: 218; JUNKER 1932: 38f; DELCOR 1968: 298; *ibid.* 1971: 145; NOTH 1957: 268; BRYAN 1995: 222, n. 51; BAUER 1996: 149, 260.

¹³⁵ MARTI 1901: 49; GOETTSBERGER 1928: 53; CHARLES 1929: 176; BEEK 1935: 8; BENTZEN 1937: 31f = 1952: 59f; HEATON 1956: 176; JEFFERY 1956: 453; NOTH 1957: 267; RHODES 1961: 417; KOCH 1961: 9, 11; PORTEOUS 1962: 85; PLÖGER 1965: 108; LEUPOLD 1969: 288; COLLINS 1993b; BARTELMUS 1993: 292.

¹³⁶ MONTGOMERY 1927: 287; STEINMANN 1950: 105 = *ibid.* 1960: 85; BICKERMANN 1967: 102f; TOWNER 1984: 93; ARCHER 1985: 86 (unique is the reference to the Babylonian silver shekel of the satrap Mazaeus depicting a lion).

¹³⁷ BAUMGARTNER 1926: 22; 1939: 218 (cf. GRESSMANN 1909: no. 168 = *ibid.* 1927: no. 380 = JASTROW 1912: no. 120; *ibid.* nos. 100, 193, 195; SARRE 1922: pl. 16); JUNKER 1932: 38 (cf. GRESSMANN 1909: no. 168 = *ibid.* 1927: no. 380 = JASTROW 1912: no. 120); cf. also STEINMANN 1960: 86.

¹³⁸ HITZIG 1850: 102 with n. * (cf. LAYARD 1854: 421, 424, 184 with fig. 13, 43 with fig. 3, cf. also SCHRADER 1894: 1091; mentioned by HITZIG is furthermore R. ROCHETTE in *Journal des Savants* Nov. 1849, p. 676 and Jan. 1859, pp. 34f); KEIL 1872: 223; BEHRMANN 1894: 44 (cf. the depiction in SCHRADER 1894: 1091); YOUNG 1953: 143 (followed HITZIG); DELCOR 1968: 145; *ibid.* 1971: 145 (cf. PRITCHARD 1954: no. 646).

scription of the winged lion in Dan 7 received further attention: (a) the wings,¹⁴⁰ (b) the plucking off of the lion's wings,¹⁴¹ and (c) the rampant posture of the lion.¹⁴²

Finally, one can observe that many scholars who supported their statements with bibliographical references, most notably NOTH (1957: 268) and COLLINS (1993b: 218), derived their information from JUNKER's (1932: 38f) work on the iconographic aspect of Dan 7. Exceptions are BAUMGARTNER (1926: 22) and DELCOR (1971: 145)¹⁴³ who display independent contributions.

2.13.2. Bear

The first significant iconographic treatment of the motif of the Danielic bear was made by JUNKER (1932: 36f, 40). According to JUNKER the bear cannot be regarded as a mythological motif as it only rarely¹⁴⁴ appears in ancient Near Eastern iconography and is missing altogether in Babylonian and Assyrian representations. The two examples JUNKER cited are the depiction of a bear in a hunting scene on a Persian cylinder seal¹⁴⁵ and a bear on an old Sumerian plaque of shell inlay – being possibly part of a lyre – excavated at Ur from a grave dated to the 25th century B.C.E.¹⁴⁶

Following JUNKER, BAUMGARTNER (1939: 218) affirmed the non-mythological function of the bear in iconography and underlined the scarcity of its appearance

¹³⁹ DELCOR 1968: 145; *ibid.* 1971: 145 (cf. PRITCHARD 1954: no. 647). Cf. however the criticism by STAUB (1978: 354f, n. 10), since the adduced parallel has no feline element at all.

¹⁴⁰ JUNKER (1932: 38) discussed the meaning of wings in Assyrian–Babylonian art by stating: “Die Flügel sind in der assyrisch–babylonischen Kunst Attribute, die ein Wesen als überirdisch, als Geistwesen oder als Dämon kennzeichnen. Geflügelte Tiergestalten sind Darstellungen von Schutzgeistern [reference to GRESSMANN 1927: no. 378 = a winged *Mischwesen* having a body of a bull and a human head]; bekannt ist auch eine geflügelte Dämonengestalt [reference to *ibid.* no. 383 = storm demon Pazuzu].”

¹⁴¹ JUNKER 1932: 38 (cf. WEBER 1920: nos. 110, 302, 310, 336).

¹⁴² MEYER 1921: 195, n. 1 (not specified reference to rampant winged animals on Babylonian and Persian sculptures); JUNKER 1932: 38f (cf. WEBER 1920: nos. 15–17, 18, 20, 22–26, 44); NOTH 1957: 268 (cf. WEBER 1920: nos. 15, 17, 64, 101, 117); COLLINS 1993b: 297 (cf. WEBER 1920: nos. 17, 64, 101; PRITCHARD 1954: no. 192); BAUER 1996: 150, fig. 23.

¹⁴³ Cf. n. 139.

¹⁴⁴ In regard to the reason for rarity of depictions of bears NOTH (1957: 268) stated: “... der Bär [ist] im alten Orient nur sehr selten in der bildenden Kunst dargestellt worden. Begreiflicherweise; denn in den Flussoasen, die die Zentren der altorientalischen Kulturentfaltung waren, ist der Bär nicht zu Hause. Er kommt nur in den Gebirgen vor, und die wenigen Abbildungen von Bären, die bekannt sind, stammen denn auch aus dem iranischen Gebirge und dessen Nachbarschaft” (cf. a very similar statement PERROT/CHIPIEZ 1884: 751; see also HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 212; BARTELMUS 1993: 293).

¹⁴⁵ WEBER 1920: no. 511 = DELAPORTE 1910: no. 405.

¹⁴⁶ WOOLLEY n.d.: pl. 7 = GADD 1929: pl. 8 = JEREMIAS 1929: 440, fig. 241 = RUTTEN 1938: 106, fig. 12 = PRITCHARD 1954: no. 192 = BAUER 1996: 150, fig. 23.

therein. Nevertheless, his reference¹⁴⁷ to HILZHEIMER'S (1928: 398f) article in the *Reallexikon der Assyrologie* mentioned three¹⁴⁸ additional depictions with bears: a bowl in bronze from Nineveh depicting two bears searching for food,¹⁴⁹ a Persian cylinder seal showing the hunting of a bear,¹⁵⁰ and an Elamite Kudurru depicting a bear.¹⁵¹ Furthermore, he added to this a bear amulet from Tell Brak¹⁵² and a similar motif to that found on the lyre of Ur from Tell Halaf.¹⁵³

Besides remarking that the bear seldom appears in ancient Near Eastern art and adding one more example to the known list of depictions of bears,¹⁵⁴ BENTZEN (1952: 60 = *ibid.* 1937: 32¹⁵⁵) criticised JUNKER'S statement that the bear does not function as a mythological animal. He referred to GADD'S (1929: 35–37) discussion of the plaque of shell from the lyre of Ur which concluded that the function of the various animals on the plaque is most probably of an apotropaic nature.

Subsequent treatments of the topic only restated JUNKER'S and BAUMGARTNER'S findings (JEFFREY 1956: 454; NOTH 1957: 268; RHODES 1961: 418; COLLINS 1993b: 297; BARTELMUS 1993: 293 with n. 15).

Apart from the occurrence of the bear, its raised posture mentioned in Dan 7 was linked to iconography. In 1835 VON Lengerke took up a suggestion by MÜNTER (1827: 112, pl. 3) who compared the raised posture of one side of the Danielic bear with Babylonian depictions.¹⁵⁶ He was followed by MONTGOMERY (1927: 288). It

¹⁴⁷ BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218f, n. 1.

¹⁴⁸ HILZHEIMER (1928: 399) mentioned an additional reference for a bear, namely, *ILN*, no. 4637, vol. 172, 3 March 1928. However, the depictions on pp. 337–339 in this issue of the “Illustrated London News” reporting on WOOLLEY'S excavation of royal graves at Ur do not show any bear. The only connection to the bear could be the depiction of a bull head on the top right of page 337 which resembles the bull head of the lyre of Ur with its plaque of shell depicting a bear. But according to the description of the picture in the “Illustrated London News” the bull head is made of silver, while the bull head of the lyre of Ur is made of gold (PRITCHARD 1954: 271, no. 193). Interestingly enough the comment on the bottom of page 337 of the “Illustrated London News” speaks of two bull heads, one in copper and one in gold. The top left picture shows a bull head in copper. Is the right one perhaps the one made of gold? An additional reference is according to Hilzheimer “ZDP VII, S. 19, Abb. 12”. However, vol. 8 of the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* does not have any depiction on p. 19 and the article does not relate to the topic.

¹⁴⁹ LAYARD 1853: fig. 66 = PERROT/CHIPIEZ 1884: 751, fig. 408.

¹⁵⁰ DELAPORTE 1910: no. 404.

¹⁵¹ TOSCANNE 1911: 227, fig. 464.

¹⁵² *ILN* Nr. 5191 (15 October 1938): 701, 18.

¹⁵³ HILZHEIMER cited: Ungnad, *Festschrift M. Oppenheim*, 1934, 134ff.

¹⁵⁴ BENTZEN (1937: 32; *ibid.* 1952: 60) referred to R. O'Callaghan, *Symbolae Hrozný III*, 356.

¹⁵⁵ The first edition has no bibliographical reference to depictions of bears.

¹⁵⁶ “Wir denken uns das Thier (*sic*) also als halbaufgerichtet, entweder stehend auf den Vorderfüßen, ruhend mit dem hinteren Leibe, in Trägheit, wie sie dem Bären eigen ist, den eben verschlungenen Frass verdauend, oder man vergleiche die Vorstellung in einem babylonischen Steinbilde, worüber Münter, *Relig. de[r] Bab.* S. 112 bemerkt: ‘Unter dem Sterne Bels unterbricht die Reihe der Altäre ein mythisches Thier, das an die Gesichte Daniels erinnert. Es hat die Bildung eines Ziegenbocks, ist aber mit Schuppen gepanzert

was JUNKER, however, who refuted the adduced evidence.¹⁵⁷ A further attempt to bring the raised posture of the bear in Dan 7 in relation with iconography was undertaken by NOTH (1957: 268) who compared it with a rampant bear ready to attack. NOTH's explanation was taken up recently by COLLINS (1993b: 298), with the difference that he mentioned only one of three references given by NOTH, namely, the one that does indeed depict an attacking bear.¹⁵⁸

2.13.3. Leopard

General statements about iconographic parallels to the winged four-headed leopard of Dan 7 point out that ancient Near Eastern art knows of various composite animal figures with wings and several heads (NOTH 1957: 268f; KRAELING 1933: 228; DAY 1985: 155; UEHLINGER 1995: 821).

The first specific iconographic parallel to the winged four-headed leopard was proposed by BAUMGARTNER (1926: 22) in a reference to a Hittite relief from Carchemish,¹⁵⁹ dated after 1000 B.C.E. However, he acknowledged that the animal of this representation had only two heads and that the identification with a leopard was not correct.¹⁶⁰ Thirteen years later in his review of Danielic research, BAUMGARTNER (1939: 218) was silent about his earlier proposal.

It was again JUNKER (1932: 41f) who presented the most significant treatment of the motif of the leopard. He mentioned, apart from literary references stemming from Egypt¹⁶¹ and Sumer,¹⁶² the iconographic representations of the leopard. How-

und hat zwei kleine Flügel. Die Hörner sind gross und gewunden und gleichen den Hörnern der Ovis στρεψκέρας, einer Bocksgattung, die im Orient und in Ungarn einheimisch ist. Der Huf ist gespalten. *Das Thier (sic) liegt knieend auf dem rechten Vorderfuss, ist aber im Begriff mit dem linken aufzustehen.* Wir finden denselben Bock, gleichfalls vor einem Altare, und in derselben Stellung liegend, auf den Babylonischen Steinen in den Fundgruben des Orients ...” (VON Lengerke 1835: 304f).

¹⁵⁷ “Jedoch das von Montgomery herangezogene Motiv dürfte kaum in dem angegebenen Sinne zu deuten sein. Vgl. die Abbildungen bei Weber, Nr. 538 und Jastrow, Bildermappe 63 d, 64 und 126. Hier scheint es sich um symbolische Tiergestalten zu handeln, die vor dem Lebensbaum kniend huldigen. Eine Stellung, bei der zwei Beine auf derselben Seite halb emporgehoben sind, wäre auch zu unnatürlich und als ‘Ruhestellung’ ganz unmöglich für ein Tier” (JUNKER 1932: 40).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. WEBER 1920: no. 511. The two other references by NOTH (1957: 268, n. 28) refer to a raised bear collecting probably some fruits from a tree and a walking bear on an Elamite Kudurru (cf. ns. 149 and 151).

¹⁵⁹ WEBER 1922: pl. 14.

¹⁶⁰ WEBER (ibid. p. 18, no. 14) identified it as sphinx as did GRESSMANN (1927: 113) who mentioned in the discussion of his no. 388, which he identified as Hittite sphinx, the example from Carchemish as parallel. PRITCHARD (1954: no. 644) designated it as composite winged creature.

¹⁶¹ Thutmose III (1479–1426) is said to attack his enemies like a strong youthful panther that approaches resting cattle; Ramses III (1187–1156) is called a panther in battle; Amenophis II (1426–1400) is furious like a female panther, when he comes onto the battlefield. Apart from these royal uses, the metaphor of being furious like a panther is also found in common texts such as fairytales and legends of gods (GRAPOW 1924: 73).

ever, he conceded that these depictions of leopards do not correspond exactly to the winged four-headed leopard as described in Dan 7, since none of them has wings or multiple heads. JUNKER mentioned leopard statuettes from royal Egyptian tombs,¹⁶³ depictions of priests wearing leopard skins,¹⁶⁴ a Hittite procession of gods from the 15th–14th centuries,¹⁶⁵ and two cylinder seals.¹⁶⁶

Further treatments of the iconographic background of the leopard in Dan 7, such as BENTZEN'S (1937: 33), JEFFERY'S (1956: 454), NOTH'S (1957: 268f), and RHODES' (1961: 419) are essentially all based on JUNKER'S work and corroborate that there are indeed depictions of leopards, but that they do not correspond to the Danielic version. The only additional example to JUNKER'S list of leopard representations was recently made by COLLINS (1993b: 298, n. 189), namely, a Sumerian cylinder seal from Early Dynastic III from the middle of the third millennium.¹⁶⁷

Apart from the discussion of leopards *per se*, some scholars also dealt with the attributes of the four heads and four wings. MONTGOMERY (1927: 289) referred to the Babylonian winged lions as an example for the position of the wings. JUNKER (1932: 42) mentioned the numerous depictions of four- or six-winged human figures¹⁶⁸ and two-headed figures.¹⁶⁹ The missing four-headed representations were explained by JUNKER as resulting from the artistic difficulty in representing more than two heads. BICKERMANN (1967: 102) referred in a general way to winged beasts with several heads as common Babylonian imagery.

2.13.4. Fourth Beast

A brief remark by MONTGOMERY (1927: 291f) in which he referred to the numismatic representations of the Syrian kings as a possible explanation for the horns of the fourth beast,¹⁷⁰ should become a constituent element in many subsequent

¹⁶² The Sumerian king Gudea speaks of the "divine leopard, who fills with fear" and is said to have attached to a temple door a young lion and a young panther (JUNKER 1932: 42). Furthermore, the panther is also known as one of the "evil seven" demons (MEISSNER 1925: 200).

¹⁶³ Cf. WIEDEMANN 1920: 243 with reference to DARSSEY 1902: 160 no. 24621, 161 no. 24622 with plate 34 that depicts two cedar statuettes of panthers *en passant* from the tomb of Amenophis II (1426–1400); CARTER/NEWBERRY 1904: 15 no. 46066 with plate 5 depicting a wooden statuette of a prowling panther from the tomb of Thutmose IV (1400–1390) and DAVIS 1912: 103, no. 14, pl. 82 with a statuette of a wooden leopard from the tomb of Haremhab (1319–1292). Panthers are also depicted on rock tomb scenes at Tell el-Amarna where they appear among the people that bring tribute to Akhenaten (1353–1336) (DAVIES 1905a: pl. 38; *ibid.* 1905b: pl. 15) and on a processional scene of Thutmose III (1479–1426) at the temple of Deir el Bahari (NAVILLE 1906: pl. 125).

¹⁶⁴ WIEDEMANN 1920: 369, fig. 72 and pl./fig. 26.

¹⁶⁵ GRESSMANN 1927: no. 338.

¹⁶⁶ WEBER 1920: nos. 237, 238 (no. 238 = DE MORGAN 1905: pl. 20:1).

¹⁶⁷ PRITCHARD 1954: no. 678.

¹⁶⁸ GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 379, 380, 382, 383; WEBER 1920: nos. 36, 37, 45–47, 54.

¹⁶⁹ WEBER 1920: no. 316a; JASTROW 1912: no. 32; GRESSMANN 1927: no. 388.

¹⁷⁰ "For the horns as symbol of the Seleucid kings s. Babelon, *Les rois de Syrie* (Paris National Library, *Cat. des monnaies grecques*), pp. xviii *seq.*"

discussions of iconographic parallels to the fourth beast of Dan 7. His second reference on this topic, namely, to the “monstrous *širuššu* beast” which “would have given a prototype from Bab.art” (ibid. 290; cf. however above p. 6) did not find general acceptance. Any parallel to the hybrid animals¹⁷¹ of Babylonian–Assyrian art was rejected by JUNKER (1932: 43), and indeed was not adduced subsequently by any scholar. JUNKER, who made the most distinguished effort to enlighten the iconographic background of Dan 7, made no attempt to find any iconographic parallel to the fourth beast, because “in der Unbestimmtheit dieses Tieres soll die Phantasie Raum und Möglichkeit haben, alles Schreckliche hineinzulegen” (ibid.).

MONTGOMERY’s remark that the horns of the fourth beast of Dan 7 are a symbol of the Seleucid kings was more systematically treated by S. MORENZ. First MORENZ pointed out that the horn was a general symbol of power in the ancient Near East.¹⁷² Contrary to expectations, MORENZ did not proceed to explain why such a general symbol became an exclusive code for the Seleucid kings.¹⁷³ Instead he focused on the question why the Seleucids, and in particular Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164) – whom he equated as a presupposition to his study with the fourth beast¹⁷⁴ –

¹⁷¹ As example JUNKER (1932: 43, n. 1) mentioned the *mušrussu* (sic) or *Schlangengreif* (cf. GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 370, 371).

¹⁷² Cf. also STEINMANN 1950: 110 = ibid. 1960: 87 and the representation on p. 88 of Sargon wearing a horned cap; NOTH 1957: 270 with reference to GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 378, 381; PORTER 1983: 74f with reference to A. PARROT 1962: 224, figs. 276, 277 and OPPENHEIM 1962: 224, fig. 29.

¹⁷³ Nevertheless MORENZ could not resist the temptation to elevate in the course of his essay the bull horn as distinctive mark of the Seleucid kings by designating it even as “seleukidisches Eigengut” (1951: 153). STAUB (1978: 376, n. 82) rejected this thesis by referring to a coin of Ptolemy I Soter (367–283) (ibid. 369, fig. 3) depicting Alexander the Great with ram horns positioned at the temple. However, STAUB might have misunderstood MORENZ’s statements that “Hörnerschmuck” is “seleukidisches Eigengut” and that the Ptolemies had nothing similar to show. When MORENZ spoke in generic terms of the Seleucid horned headgear he probably had in mind only the bull horn (“... das Horn der Seleukiden ... ist ein Stierhorn” [1951: 153]) which would automatically have excluded the Ptolemaic coin mentioned by STAUB. On the other hand, MORENZ (ibid.) brushed off too lightly a Macedonian coin of Demetrius Poliorketes (294–283) (LANGE 1938: 50 = STAUB 1978: 372, fig. 6) as a singular counter-evidence against a distinctive Seleucid mark. A second coin of Demetrius with bull horns is depicted in WELLES 1986: 449, top right. Lastly, one wonders why MORENZ pushed the case of the bull horn as a distinctive mark of the Seleucids when he finally also counted Macedonian coins of Lysimachus (285–281) depicting in idealistic fashion Alexander the Great with ram horns (cf. LANGE 1938: 45 = STAUB 1978: 369, fig. 4; a similar one is found in WELLES 1986: 449) among the Seleucid coins, based on the explanation that Alexander was perceived by the author of Dan 7 as the ancestor of the hated Seleucids (1951: 153 with n. 6). If the Macedonian representations of Alexander with ram horns evoked a connection to the fourth beast why should the coins of Ptolemy I Soter likewise depicting Alexander with ram horns not also have done so? If so, can a specific link between the Seleucids and the horns of the Danielic fourth beast be upheld?

¹⁷⁴ “Das vierte Tier muss also die Macht verkörpern, deren Taten Leben und Gegenwart des Apokalyptikers erschauern lassen. Man hat längst erkannt, dass hier das Seleukidenreich in der Person Antiochos’ IV. und sein totalitärer Übergriff auf den jüdischen Freistaat konterfeit sei” (MORENZ 1951: 151).

could be symbolised by horns. The central question of his article was: “Warum hat gerade das Tier der Seleukiden Hörner?” (1951: 152). MORENZ answered this question by stating that:

dem Apokalyptiker und seinen Lesern eine unmittelbare Anschauung gegeben [war] ..., die zugleich in unüberbietbarer Stärke die Assoziation der verhassten Seleukiden auslösen musste. Diese Anschauung bieten seleukidische Münzen, die den König im Hörnerschmuck darstellen (ibid.).

As evidence MORENZ (ibid. 152f) referred to two Seleucid coins showing Seleucus I Nicator (312–281)¹⁷⁵ and his son Antiochus I Soter (280–261)¹⁷⁶ wearing bull horns.¹⁷⁷ After tracing the horns on these coins back to the Mesopotamian horned crown,¹⁷⁸ MORENZ added coins minted by the Macedonian ruler Lysimachus (285–281) which depict Alexander the Great with rams’ horns because Alexander “ist ja in den Gedanken des Apokalyptikers der verwünschte Ahnherr des fluchwürdigen Hauses” (ibid. 153; cf. also above n. 173). MORENZ (ibid. 153f) concluded his article on a defensive note: Although horned portraits are known of only the first two Seleucid kings and none of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the argument that the horned beast in Dan 7 triggered the association with Antiochus IV Epiphanes is still valid because old Seleucid coins remained in circulation and those with representations of Alexander had several mintages.

MORENZ’S position was taken up by JEFFERY who also added that “the human-headed centaurs pictured at Persepolis have twelve horns apiece ...” (1956: 456), by NOTH (1957: 270) who pointed out the Mesopotamian background of the horned crown,¹⁷⁹ and KOCH (1961: 6). COLLINS followed NOTH and mentioning also the general ancient Near Eastern artistic background of the horned crown,¹⁸⁰ also considered “a more specific reference to the Seleucid dynasty” (1993b: 299). Recently BAUER (1996: 152, 154 with figs. 26–28) and T. STAUBLI (1997: 337, Abb. 258–260) restated the connection between the Danielic horns and representations of Seleucid rulers.

Of particular interest in regard to MORENZ’S explanation of the horns of the fourth beast is an article by U. STAUB in which the author not only followed MORENZ’S basic postulate concerning the horns (1978: 367–381) but developed his argument further by proposing a specific identification of the fourth beast based on iconographic evidence (ibid. 382–396). STAUB (ibid. 359–362) presupposed the

¹⁷⁵ Cf. LANGE 1938: 46 = STAUB 1978: 368, fig. 1.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. IMHOOF-BLUMER 1885: 73 with pl. III, no. 8 = STAUB 1978: 372, fig. 5.

¹⁷⁷ The portrait on the coin of Seleucus I Nicator is most probably an idealistic representation of Alexander the Great and that on the coin of Antiochus I Nicator is a depiction of his father Seleucus I Nicator (MORENZ 1951: 152f; STAUB 1978: 370 with n. 65 and p. 374; COLLINS 1993b: 299).

¹⁷⁸ Reference is made to GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 43, 45, 47, 318, 367, 368. Cf. also LANGE’S (1938: 47) reference to Old Babylonian and Assyrian gods depicted with horns and STAUB 1978: 375.

¹⁷⁹ Reference is made to GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 378, 381.

¹⁸⁰ Reference is made to PRITCHARD 1954: nos. 513–515, 525, 526, 646, 647 and GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 318, 378, 381.

identification of the fourth beast with the Hellenistic empire and the eleventh horn with Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164) but did not attempt to prove that the horn-motif is a unique identifier for the *Seleucid* kings (cf. above n. 173 on p. 49). His interest was focused much more on the question as to why the horn-motif was selected by the author of the Book of Daniel to code *Hellenistic* kings. Thus STAUB stated: “Es soll hier kurz versucht werden, zu erklären, warum die hellenistischen Monarchen vom Verfasser von Daniel 7 durch Hörner veranschaulicht werden” (ibid. 366).

As far as to MORENZ’S argument, STAUB added an additional type of coin depicting Seleucus I Nicator (312–281) with bull horns (1978: 373f, fig. 8) and a second type depicting Ptolemy I Soter (367–283) with ram horns positioned at the temple (ibid. 371, 376, 369, fig. 3). Furthermore, STAUB considered coins depicting elephant tusks protruding from a cap of elephant skin worn by Seleucus I Nicator (ibid. 376f, fig. 9) as possibly belonging to the same class of coins as those showing proper horns.¹⁸¹ In addition he pointed to coins of Seleucus I Nicator and Antiochus I Soter (280–261) which show a horned horse, thereby also connecting the horn-motif to the Seleucids (ibid. 378, 380, fig. 10).

In contrast to MORENZ who mentioned only two Seleucid coins, STAUB proposed a much larger and more heterogeneous list in terms of origin (Seleucid, Macedonian and Ptolemaic coins) and nature (bull horns, ram horns, elephant tusks, horned horses). This almost pan-Hellenistic usage of the horn-motif therefore prevented STAUB from arguing that the horn-motif is a unique Seleucid identifier (cf. above n. 173 on p. 49).¹⁸²

However, STAUB (ibid. 378) recognised two threats to his position. First he realised that his argument would be seriously undermined if the horn-motif was not attested during the time it is believed Dan 7 was authored. Since STAUB could not point to any horn-motif on portraits of Hellenistic kings after 280 B.C.E., he tried to counteract this weakness by pointing to Ptolemaic Lagidic coins depicting horns of plenty (ibid. 378, 380, fig. 10).¹⁸³ He thereby suggested that there was already in pre-Seleucid-dominated Palestine a general awareness of the horn-motif which provided an additional basis to code Hellenistic rulers in Dan 7 with horns.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹ Cf. also the idealistic portrait of Alexander minted by Ptolemy I Soter (STAUB 1978: 369, fig. 3) with a similar cap.

¹⁸² While rejecting the notion that the horn was “seleukidisches Eigengut”, STAUB cautiously concluded that the horn represents “tatsächlich eine Art ‘seleukidisches Hauszeichen’” (STAUB 1978: 378). So also recently BAUER 1996: 154 with figures 26–28.

¹⁸³ STAUB was followed in this regard by BAUER (ibid. fig. 27).

¹⁸⁴ Whether Lagidic coins with horns of plenty should have prepared the way to connect the horn motif of Daniel 7 with the Seleucids remains very doubtful for the simple reason that “there is not a single instance of a cornucopia on a Seleucid coin before a series of seven bronze coins minted by Demetrius I, Soter (162–150 B.C.)” (GOODENOUGH 1958: 107). It makes little sense to use a Greek numismatic motif of the pre-Seleucid period to suggest that it contributed to the association of the Danielic horn motif with the Seleucids, and particularly with Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164), when the very same motif was minted for the first time by the Seleucids only after Antiochus IV Epiphanes. It is also questionable whether the negatively charged horn of Dan 7 should be associated with the cornucopia of the unpopular Seleucids since the Hasmoneans themselves minted this

The second problem STAUB (ibid. 378) mentioned is the historical fact that Palestine was under Ptolemaic rule until 198 B.C.E., making it unlikely that Seleucid coins were already widely known at the time Dan 7 is believed to have been written. The mention of this problem by STAUB is significant in so far as it reveals that the objective of his article was not only to find a rationale as to why the ten horns of Dan 7 were used as code for the Hellenistic kings in general (ibid. 366f), but that it was aimed in essence very specifically at the Seleucid empire and here in particular to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164). In this regard it is indeed very unfortunate that not a single horned representation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes could be cited and that even horned representations of Hellenistic rulers in general are not attested after 280 B.C.E. STAUB was forced to assume, as was MORENZ, that such coins were reminted and were in circulation as late as the middle of the second century B.C.E.¹⁸⁵ In addition STAUB was aware that he had to establish that there was a widespread knowledge of Seleucid coins despite Ptolemaic rule over Palestine down to 198 B.C.E. The only argument put forward by STAUB (ibid. 378) to counteract this problem was the assumption that the basically unified Hellenistic economy would most probably have meant that Seleucid coins were not entirely unknown in Ptolemaic Palestine. On the basis of this evidence STAUB concluded in regard to the horn-motif:

Damit ist meiner Ansicht nach genügend wahrscheinlich gemacht, dass die Münzen der hellenistischen, vor allem der seleukidischen Herrscher den möglichen historischen Grund zu deren Chiffrierung unter dem Symbol des Horns abgaben. Auch wirkt eine solche ikonographische Erklärung von Daniel 7,7 f. nicht gekünstelt, wenn bedacht wird, dass die oben besprochenen Münzen mit ihrem Hörnermotiv als ein alltägliches Zahlungsmittel durch die Hände der jüdischen Untertanen hellenistischer Monarchen gingen (ibid. 381).

pagan symbol on their coins as early as the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–104) (HILL 1914: Pl. 20:17; REIFENBERG 1940: Nos. 8–11), suggesting that they themselves did not associate the cornucopia with their hated enemies. Lastly, in regard to the Lagidic coins used by STAUB in his argument it is to point out that he did not use coins from Palestine which one would consider the starting point of such a discussion but turned instead to those of Alexandria. His reference (STAUB 1978:380, n. 91) to P. THOMSEN ("Beth-Zur" *AfO* 8 [1932–1933] 87) who stated that Lagidic coins were also in circulation in Palestine is of little value because it does not specify the type of coins and whether they are relevant to the discussion.

¹⁸⁵ Concerning the lack of horned representations of Hellenistic rulers after 280 B.C.E. it is rather surprising that neither STAUB nor MORENZ nor any later supporter of their arguments established a corpus of coins from Palestine of the period under discussion and evaluated their finds in terms of number, iconography, date of circulation, and relevance for the present discussion. Apart from the problem of the lack of coins after 280 B.C.E., the adduced coins do not stem from excavations in Palestine/Israel (the coins cited were minted in Persepolis, Alexandria, Thrace, Macedonia, Pergamon, Ecbatana, Iran). It is therefore an urgent desideratum to study the *numismatic context in Palestine/Israel* in order to be able to make a qualified statement regarding the relevance of the numismatic argument.

Based on this conviction STAUB (ibid. 382–396) developed the association of the Seleucids with the fourth beast of Dan 7, not only in regard to the horns but also to the beast as such, by identifying it as a code for the Seleucid war elephants. STAUB referred in this regard to: (a) iconographic evidence from coins of Ptolemy I Soter (367–283)¹⁸⁶ and Seleucus I Nicator (312–281)¹⁸⁷ which depict the ruler wearing an elephant-skin cap, as well as coins of Antiochus III the Great (223–187)¹⁸⁸ showing on the reverse an Indian elephant (ibid. 382–284);¹⁸⁹ (b) contemporary knowledge of war elephants among the local inhabitants (ibid. 387); (c) literary references in 1 and 2 Maccabees (ibid. 387–389). The final identification of the Seleucid war elephant with the fourth beast of Dan 7 rested in essence¹⁹⁰ on the argument that, due to a misunderstanding,¹⁹¹ the tusk-bearing elephant was counted among the horned animals. Thus STAUB stated:

Doch mit dem Hinweis auf die elfenbeineren Stosszähne, die dem Elefanten durchaus den Charakter eines Hornträgers zu verleihen vermochten ... nähern wir uns der Wahrscheinlichkeit, im vierten Tier, dessen hervorstechendes Attribut doch die Hörner bilden, einen Elefanten erkennen zu dürfen (ibid. 392).

STAUB (ibid.) underlined his argument by a renewed reference to numismatic portraits¹⁹² dating to the end of the 4th century B.C.E., which depict Alexander the Great as wearing an elephant-skin cap with protruding elephant tusks mounted on the height of the forehead, and to coins of the early 3rd century B.C.E., which show elephants wearing what STAUB identified as bull horns (ibid. 393, figs. 14f).¹⁹³ He

¹⁸⁶ Cf. STAUB 1978: 369, fig. 3. For an elephant quadriga see JENKINS 1972: no. 563.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. STAUB 1978: 377, fig. 9. For a striding elephant see NEWELL 1937: 21.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. STAUB 1978: 379, fig. 12 and for further references ibid. 384, n. 102.

¹⁸⁹ The iconographic references in this regard are informative but as with all of STAUB's adduced coins (cf. above ns. 184, 185) there is none from Palestine. STAUB correctly referred to *literary* evidence of the second century B.C.E. from Palestine/Israel indicating that the local inhabitants knew of war elephants. However it is problematic to link this Palestinian literary evidence now with iconographic references which date to the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C.E. and do not come from Palestine/Israel but from Alexandria and as far as from Ecbatana or of an unknown workshop in Iran.

¹⁹⁰ Additional arguments, which according to STAUB (ibid. 391f) are not conclusive, are the description of the fourth beast as "crushing" and "stamping" possibly referring to the crushing of food and the stamping of the elephant's feet. Furthermore the dual reading of שנין ("teeth") which might not only indicate two rows of teeth as it generally does, but two tusks.

¹⁹¹ Cited were Eze 27:15 which describes elephant tusks as "teeth of horns" (קרנות שן) and literary indications that there was disagreement whether elephant tusks are to be considered as horns or not (ibid. 390f).

¹⁹² Cf. ibid. 369, fig. 3 and 377, fig. 9; LANGE 1938: 42; JENKINS 1972: no. 502; cf. however the remarks above in n. 189.

¹⁹³ It is rather problematic that STAUB adduced a coin from Susa (STAUB 1978: 393, fig. 14) and one possibly from Persepolis (ibid. fig. 15) dating to the early 3rd century B.C.E. to underline an interpretation of a Palestinian text of the second century B.C.E. Furthermore, two coins are not a very good basis for such a specific interpretation of a text as STAUB undertakes. In addition it has to be pointed out that the coin from Susa is of rare mintage

concluded his argument by stating: “Auf alle Fälle lässt sich Daniel 7,7 ebenso gut auf einen Elefanten hin ausdeuten wie auf einen Drachen, dessen einziger Vorteil darin besteht, dass auch die widersprüchlichsten Attribute in ihm noch Platz finden” (ibid.).

In regard to the identification of the fourth beast with an elephant, STAUB’s view was recently followed tentatively by GOLDINGAY (1988: 152, 163) and HAAG (1993a: 162; ibid. 1993b: 58), while STAUBLI (1997: 337) and BAUER (1996: 151–153 with figs. 24f) did not raise any objections.¹⁹⁴

(JENKINS 1972: 240), thus making it even less likely to be relevant. In regard to the identification of the pointed headgear of the elephants on these two coins, one would wish (on a methodological note) an iconographic parallel which would support their identification as horns.

¹⁹⁴ Critical remarks against an iconographic influence include the following:

- (1) While ancient Near Eastern iconography depicts various winged predators, the bear is not known as a mythological animal (CAQUOT 1955: 8 [cf. BAUMGARTNER 1939: 218]; DELCOR 1968: 298 = ibid. 1971: 145) and seldom depicted (STAUB 1978: 354; PORTER 1983: 35; TOWNER 1984: 93; DAY 1985: 155; LUCAS 1990: 161);
- (2) Representations of leopards are scant (STAUB 1978: 354; PORTER 1983: 35; TOWNER 1984: 93; DAY 1985: 155; LUCAS 1990: 161);
- (3) The winged lion is almost unknown in ancient Near Eastern iconography (KEEL 1978: 110 n. 331; STAUB 1978: 354 with n. 10; PORTER 1983: 35f; cf. also HAAG 1993b: 57 = ibid. 1993a: 161);
- (4) No convincing parallels exist for all four beasts (GOLDINGAY 1988: 151), respectively the fourth (TOWNER 1984: 93);
- (5) The following critical remarks were directed against MORENZ: the (bull) horn is not a distinctive mark for the Seleucids because: (a) depictions of horned Hellenistic rulers are not confined to the Seleucids (cf. ns. 173 on p. 49); (b) “the fact that the kings of Media and Persia are also symbolized by a ram bearing two horns (Daniel 8:3, 20) indicates that horns are not a specific mark of the Seleucids for the writer” (DAY 1985: 156) and therefore also not for the Greek empire at large;
- (6) The following critical remarks were directed against STAUB: (a) the horn is not a specific mark for the Greek empire and the post-Alexander kingdoms (cf. previous paragraph under [b]); (b) “Staub ... identifies the fourth beast as an elephant. The motif of trampling fits this identification, but there is nothing else in the description to support it” (COLLINS 1993b: 299, n. 194); (c) in regard to the nameless fourth beast GOLDINGAY (1988: 163), criticising STAUB, stated: “The reason for its not being named is hardly to conceal the vision’s message from the authorities ...: it would hardly have done that ... In not naming the animal, Dan 7 follows Hos 13:5–6, where the fourth animal is also unnamed ...”; (d) cf. also above ns. 184, 185, 189, 193.

3. The motifs of the judgement scene, the “Ancient of days”, and the “son of man” (verses 9–14)

3.1. Babylonian influence

GUNKEL's references to the second part of the vision of Dan 7 are remarkably scant. According to GUNKEL (1895: 331) the expression “son of man” is the title of the “Gottes-Überwinder”¹⁹⁵ of the underlying myth of Dan 7 which, accordingly, would be Marduk.¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, GUNKEL explained the stream of fire as a reflection of the underlying variation of the *Enuma Elish*.¹⁹⁷

It was N. SCHMIDT (1900: 27) – known for his angelic interpretation of the “son of man” – who for the first time mentioned Marduk by name as the prototype for Michael which he equated with the Danielic “son of man”.

ZIMMERN a few years later followed GUNKEL and mentioned expressly the enthronement of the “son of man” as reference to Marduk (SCHRADER/ZIMMERN/WINCKLER 1903: 390f, 523), and compared the blasphemous words spoken by the fourth beast with those of Tiamat against Marduk (ibid. 513; also J. JEREMIAS 1916: 630 with n. 3).¹⁹⁸ While GRESSMANN (1929: 368) followed ZIMMERN and defined the enthronement of the universal ruler as the common theme of Dan 7 and the *Enuma Elish*, he also added new parallels: (a) the Babylonian “tablets of destiny” relate to the Danielic books; (b) the Danielic judgement shows a relationship to the *Enuma Elish* because “der Gedanke des Gerichts der Götter ... zweifellos [auch] babylonisch [ist]” (ibid.); (c) only the rebellious Kingu was killed by Marduk, while the other rebels were set free, a fact which could explain why the judgement of the beasts of Dan 7 is not uniform. Despite all these allusions to the *Enuma Elish*, the missing parallels for the “Ancient of days”, the “son of man” and

¹⁹⁵ Misunderstood by CASEY (1979: 35) when he stated that according to GUNKEL “in the myth ‘Son of man’ was the title for the conqueror of God” (capitalisation of “god”); cf. Gunkel’s wording in n. 197.

¹⁹⁶ Although GUNKEL did not identify the “son of man” with a specific figure of the *Enuma Elish* epic, it seems obvious that the young Babylonian god Marduk is referred to who overcame Tiamat and was awarded with eternal dominion (1895: 371).

¹⁹⁷ “Auch der im Zusammenhange des Daniel so rätselhafte ‘Menschensohn, der auf den Wolken des Himmels kommt, wird zur Tradition gehören; denn es ist schwer zu sagen, wie der Verfasser von sich aus auf dies Bild gerade für Israel hätte verfallen können; zumal Israel ja in dem Gesichte schon unter dem Namen ‘die Heiligen’ erwähnt war. Im Mythos würde ‘Menschensohn’ der Titel des Gottes-Überwinders sein. Auch die an Mythologisches anklingende Beschreibung des Thrones Gottes, besonders des ‘Feuerstromes’, der von ihm ausgeht, wird ein Stück der Tradition sein” (ibid. 331).

¹⁹⁸ WINCKLER (1905: 297–299) proposed the equation of the “son of man” with Marduk on the basis of genealogy. Ea is called “man” (*amēlu*) and his son Marduk is therefore “the son of the man”, i.e., of Ea. There is however no specific reference to Dan 7 in WINCKLER’s discussion.

the eschatological outlook in Babylonian mythology were reasons that led GRESSMANN to doubt that the Babylonian explanation is indeed sound.

KRAELING (1933: 228–230) basically followed GRESSMANN by pointing to the Babylonian New Year's festival as the background for the throne scene of Dan 7¹⁹⁹ at which the *Enuma Elish* was recited, the fate of life was determined, and Marduk's sovereignty was transferred to the king of Babylon in an enthronement rite.

While **HEATON** gave biblical tradition in the second part of the vision ample room, the Danielic books provided the springboard for reference to the Babylonian "tablets of fate" and New Year's festival (1956: 179f) which he considered as possible background for the enthronement of the "son of man" (ibid. 183) whom he correlated implicitly with Marduk (ibid. 180, 185).

Although after **HEATON** the *Enuma Elish* was abandoned in favour of the Ugartitic Baal cycle, **BEASLEY-MURRAY** (1983: 46) recently still maintained that "the Akkadian Creation Epic in some respects has closer affinities to Daniel's vision" by referring to the convening of the assembly of the gods.

Soon after **GUNKEL** another Babylonian background for the "son of man" was proposed by **F. HOMMEL**. He pointed to the Babylonian Adapa,²⁰⁰ which is also designated as the "seed of mankind".²⁰¹ In the Adapa myth he is:

represented ... on the one side ... as *mortal* ... yet on the other side it equalized him with the god Marduk ... and in this way guaranteed his everlasting existence in heaven, and his future appearance among men; it is surely not too rash to assume that another portion of the Adapa legends gave direct expression to the expectations of such a reappearance (1899: 344).

Although **HOMMEL** did not specifically discuss Dan 7, pointing rather to the Messianic aspect of the god-man Adapa, he implied the Danielic "son of man" as predecessor of the New Testament "son of man".

JEREMIAS stated that the designation of Adapa as "seed of mankind" corresponded to the biblical expression for the "anderen Adam" ὁ ἄλλος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (1899: 586, n. 3) and was therefore important for the linguistic development of this expression. Furthermore **JEREMIAS** (1916: 630 n. 6 and p. 546) considered the clouds of heaven as a faded expression of a "kosmischen Wettererscheinung" in connection with an apotheosis.

Likewise short-lived was the proposal by **H.L. JANSEN** who, in his discussion of the "son of man" in 1 Enoch, also touched briefly on the Danielic "son of man". **JANSEN** traced the "son of man" back to the Babylonian god Ea-Oannes. The following features in the Book of Daniel reflect, according to **JANSEN**, his Babylonian heritage: (1) Ea-Oannes emerges from the sea as do the beasts in Dan 7

¹⁹⁹ The "Ancient of days" and the slaying of the dragon were traced back by **KRAELING** to Iranian origin.

²⁰⁰ The Adapa myth was already referred to by **GUNKEL** (1895: 148, n. 3), not in connection with Dan 7 but Gen 1 as prototype of the *Urmenschen*.

²⁰¹ On the attempt to harmonise the expressions "seed of mankind" and "son of man" cf. **W. KRISTENSEN**, "De term 'Zoon des Menschen', toegelicht uit de anthropologie der ouden," *ThT* 45 (1911) 1–38; esp. p. 4 (cited by **KEARNS** 1982: 16).

(1939: 105f);²⁰² (2) the contrast between beasts and the man-likeness of the “son of man” results from the disintegration of the *Mischgestalt* of Ea-Oannes into these two Danielic entities (ibid. 106); (3) the term “son of man” can be explained on the basis of the dual manifestation of Ea-Oannes as god and as human being. Furthermore JANSEN mentioned Tammuz who was also addressed as “man” or “mankind”. Since traits of Tammuz were transferred to most gods, the epithet “man(kind)” could also have been passed on to Ea-Oannes (ibid. 109); (4) Ea-Oannes is connected with the primordial time, therefore the principle of *Urzeit-Endzeit* can be adduced to explain the eschatological nature of the Danielic “son of man” (ibid. 110f).

Last to mention is **W.F. ALBRIGHT** (1940: 291f) who connected the expression “son of man” with the Assyrian *Atrahasis*, whose epithet is according to the Assyrian recension from the 7th century B.C.E. “man” (*amēlu*). ALBRIGHT considered the possibility that *Adapa*, also known as “the very wise” (i.e., *Atrahasis*; cf. HOMMEL 1899: 343) and “seed of mankind” (*zēr amēlūt*), was the Sumerian name of the *Atrahasis* figure. As HOMMEL had done, ALBRIGHT focused on the Messianic²⁰³ “son of man”, touching only briefly on Dan 7 as genealogical reference.²⁰⁴

²⁰² So already REITZENSTEIN 1904: 109, n. 4.

²⁰³ “There are a number of points ... which make it very probable that Atrahasis, the recurrent Mesopotamian savior of mankind from catastrophe ... was actually fused in Jewish-Aramaic tradition with the figure of the Messiah ...” (Albright 1940: 291f).

²⁰⁴ Critical remarks against a Babylonian influence include the following (cf. also n. 24 on p. 7):

- (1) Probably the harshest general criticism was voiced by KRAELING (1927: 14) when he stated: “A number of efforts have been made to solve the Son of Man problem in this way, and all have failed miserably. In the early years of this century ... the individuality of Jewish and Israelitic thought was being sacrificed on the altar of Babylonian civilization ... These efforts could be taken seriously only at a time when the novelty of Oriental discovery destroyed the sense of distance and proportion”;
- (2) *Enuma Elish*: The interpretation of the “son of man” against the background of the *Enuma Elish*, i.e., the identification with Marduk was considered with “great reservation” (MUILENBURG 1960: 207) and according to JUNKER (1932: 58) was not well received. Among the criticised issues of the “son of man” were: (a) he is not a divine being (DELCOR 1968: 306); (b) he is not slaying the fourth beast and is not involved in combat (KOCH 1980: 231) nor has he an inactive role (DELCOR 1968: 306f); (c) he does not become king over the gods (KOCH 1980: 231); (d) the designation “son of man” is not explained (DELCOR 1968: 307);
- (3) *Adapa*: While GOLDINGAY (1988: 151) was content with a general dismissal of this myth as parallel to the “son of man”, more specified remarks point out that: (a) *Adapa* has no eschatological, protological (CAQUOT 1967: 52; COLPE 1969: 412), nor judicial or salvific function (ibid.); (b) the designation “seed of mankind” linguistically parallels *בר נשא* but does not semantically contribute anything (ibid.);
- (4) *Ea-Oannes*: After MUILENBURG’S (1960: 207) doubt about the identification of the “son of man” with Ea-Oannes, COLPE expounded that although there is concurrence of some motifs the context of Ea-Oannes is a primordial cultural accomplishment which is no counterpart for an eschatological judgement (ibid.; CARAGOUNIS 1986: 39, n. 12). Recently KVANVIG (1988: 525; cf. ibid. 28ff, 191ff) simply remarked that “the concept of Ea-Oannes as described by Jansen did not exist”;

3.2. Canaanite influence

The Canaanite background of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 was launched with a reference by MONTGOMERY (1933: 111)²⁰⁵ in which he cited the Danielic "Ancient of days" as parallel to the Ugaritic phrase *'ab šnm*,²⁰⁶ although usually EISSFELDT's (1934: 578 with n. 3) statement in his *Introduction to the Old Testament* is mentioned in this regard, briefly remarking that the "Ancient of days" has now a parallel in the "king, father of years" of the Ras Shamra-texts.²⁰⁷

BENTZEN (1937: 30, 33 = *ibid.* 1952: 48, 61), referring to BAUER (1933: 15), MONTGOMERY (1935: 111), and JACK (1935: 13), likewise mentioned the "Ancient of days" as parallel to the *'ab šnm* of the Ras Shamra-texts, but added in his commentary on Daniel a second analogy, namely, the assembly of gods as found at Ugarit. In his book *Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn* BENTZEN (1948: 74 = *ibid.* 1955: 75 = *ibid.* 1970: 75) indirectly paralleled the "son of man" with the Canaanite god Baal as did BAUMGARTNER in 1939. However, most of BENTZEN's interpretation of Dan 7 focused on the alleged Israelite enthronement festival as the background of this vision (cf. p. 95). Following BENTZEN's commentary on the Book of Daniel of 1937, BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) established a further correspondence between the Canaanite god Baal and the "son of man" in Dan 7:14 by pointing out that both are said to be given eternal dominion.²⁰⁸ JEFFERY (1956: 457f) also briefly mentioned that "El is called 'king, father of years'" and repeated BENTZEN's remark on the Ugaritic assembly of gods however without taking a firm stance on a Canaanite background of Dan 7.²⁰⁹

The early discussion on the Canaanite background of the "son of man" imagery was pushed forward significantly by EMERTON. Following BENTZEN in principle, EMERTON also considered the alleged Israelite enthronement festival as the most immediate background of Dan 7 (1958: 230–234, 240; cf. below on p. 96). As se-

(5) *Atrahasis*: A link to the "son of man" has not been demonstrated (MUILENBURG 1960: 207) because *Atrahasis* has no eschatological function and the Danielic "son of man" is not a saviour (CAQUOT 1967: 52).

²⁰⁵ Although this seems to be the first published remark in this regard, the wording of MONTGOMERY's statement ("the often cited 'Ancient of Days' of Dan.") suggests that in academic circles this parallel was already very well known. Cf. also KITTEL (1924: 76f) who already equated the "Ancient of days" with the Canaanite god El.

²⁰⁶ On the various interpretations of this phrase see n. 216 on p. 60.

²⁰⁷ This remark was expanded in the second edition of EISSFELDT's *Introduction to the Old Testament* by paralleling the "Ancient of days" with the notion that El also was an aged god (1956a: 649, n. 1).

²⁰⁸ Although BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) attributed this second parallel to BENTZEN (1937: 33f) the latter does not mention it.

²⁰⁹ "Some have suggested that this picture [of the judgement scene] has drawn largely on Mesopotamian material, while others have thought of an Iranian source, and more recently Ugaritic material has raised the question of a Canaanite origin. It is not impossible that elements from all three sources have gone into the formation of various details of the picture, but for the conception of a grand assize at which the nations are to be judged by God the writer seems to have drawn in the main from the O.T. material" (JEFFERY 1956: 457).

veral scholars before him had done, EMERTON “noticed that the representation of God as the Ancient of days in Daniel. vii recalls the description of El as *’ab šnm*” (1958: 229; 234). Newly-added parallels included the remark that El is “as an aged deity with grey hair” (ibid. 229) similar to the “Ancient of days” with his white hair. He compared the “son of man” coming with the clouds of heaven with the Ugaritic Baal who “is frequently spoken of as flying on the clouds” (ibid. 232) and the slaying of Yam by Baal with the destruction of the fourth beast by the “son of man”, although the biblical text does not explicitly state this (ibid.).²¹⁰ The last aspect relating to the Ugaritic background discussed by EMERTON (ibid. 239–241) involved the relationship between the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man”. EMERTON indicated that two features parallel the Danielic vision and the Ugaritic text: First, two distinct divine figures are mentioned, and second, one of them is subordinate to the other. According to Ugaritic texts, El is superior to Baal. EMERTON proposed a similar hierarchical relationship in the early Israelite history of El (or El Elyon), and Yahweh,²¹¹ whom he equated with the Canaanite god Baal. Summarising his article, EMERTON stated: “There are good grounds for believing that the enthronement of the Son of man by an aged deity goes back to Canaanite myth and ritual, and that behind the figure of the Son of man lies Yahweh, and ultimately Baal” (ibid. 242).

Independently of EMERTON, ROST in 1958 made a very brief remark in regard to the “Ancient of days”, equating him with the Ugaritic El (1958: 42) who abdicated in favour of a younger god, or at least designated his successor.²¹²

DELCOR (1968: 302 = ibid. 1971: 150), although not absolutely convinced that the title “Ancient of days” derives from the Ugaritic *’ab šnm*, held that the concept of the elderly God in Dan 7 corresponds to the Ugaritic descriptions of El. Furthermore, he added a new feature by pointing to the judicial function of the “Ancient of days” which is paralleled in the Ugaritic texts since the god Yam is also qualified as judge (*ṣpṭ nhr* “Judge River”²¹³) indicating his power as victor. In Dan 7 this view had been demythologised in so far as that it was now applied to the “Ancient of days” who judged the four empires which received their power from the sea.

A decade after EMERTON the background of the “son of man” again received close attention with COLPE’S (1969: 403–481) article “ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου” in the

²¹⁰ Emerton upheld this equation because kingship is conferred both on Baal as well as the “son of man” after the destruction of Yam, respectively the fourth beast (EMERTON 1958: 232).

²¹¹ EMERTON (ibid. 241) mentioned as single biblical text in favour of this view Deu 32:8, 9: “When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. ⁹For the LORD’S portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance” (KJV). EMERTON however read with the LXX and a Hebrew fragment from Qumran (so also RSV) the last word of v. 8 as “El” instead of “Israel”, thus interpreting this passage so that Elyon allotted each god a nation, and in the case of Yahweh it would have been God’s people.

²¹² Similar to EMERTON (cf. n. 210) ROST reasoned whether the cause for the conferral of kingship could not have been a reflection of the victory over the chaos dragon that is associated with the enthronement of Marduk or the requests by Anat as in the Ugaritic myth (1958: 43).

²¹³ Cf. KAPELRUD 1952: 102f.

Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. After reviewing several proposals²¹⁴ COLPE concluded that only the Canaanite hypothesis can be labelled as "tragfähig" i.e., workable, displaying a rather critical and ambivalent assessment.

Thus, the heavily-cited Ugaritic term *'ab šnm* as parallel to the "Ancient of days" received a critical assessment by COLPE which was also supported by KEARNS (1982: 173f, n. 402) and COLLINS (1993a: 127 = *ibid.* 1993b: 290; cf. also below p. 70 with n. 256, no. 1). COLPE pointed out that *šnm* cannot be understood only as the genitive plural of *šnt* ("year")²¹⁵ but also as a proper name of a district or of a son of El or otherwise (1969: 420 with n. 142).²¹⁶ COLPE remarked that *'ab šnm* has in any case no direct parallel in regard to the wording (*ibid.* 419f). Likewise reserved is his evaluation of the parallel between El with a grey beard (*šbt dqn*), and the "Ancient of days" with hair like wool (*ibid.* 420; cf. also COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 21).

Much more weight was given by COLPE to two other features of Baal, namely, his epithet, "Rider of the Clouds" (*rkb 'rpt*) and his alleged²¹⁷ attempt to replace his rival El (1969: 420, 422).

A central problem of the Canaanite background of Dan 7 according to COLPE (*ibid.* 420) is the fact that no unbroken tradition can be traced back from the "Ancient of days" to the Canaanite god El. Even such a crucial link between Jewish apocalyptic and Canaanite mythology as the Israelite God Yahweh, who absorbed aspects of the Canaanite god El, does not allow clear-cut equations such as El = "Ancient of days" and Baal = "son of man". This is the case because Yahweh incorporated not only characteristics of El (e.g., supreme god) but also features of Baal (e.g., "Rider of the Clouds"), therefore prohibiting exclusive designation of El as predecessor for the "Ancient of days" and Baal for the "son of man" (*ibid.* 420f). Because predicates of two Canaanite gods were merged in Yahweh, COLPE

²¹⁴ I.e., Old Testament, Iranian, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Gnostic influences as well as rabbinical Adam speculations (COLPE 1969: 408–418).

²¹⁵ On the two plural forms *šnm* and *šnt* see CROSS 1973: 16, n. 24.

²¹⁶ A summary of the various explanations for the phrase *'ab šnm* was given by KEARNS (1982: 173, n. 402): "Father of Years" (VIROLLEAUD 1931: 198; BAUER 1933: 82); "Father of Sunem" (GORDON 1940: 50); "Father of the Exalted Ones" (POPE 1955: 33; rejection of "Father of Mortals" as suggested by EISSFELDT); *šnm* = name of a Kassitic god (EISSFELDT 1945–49: 29–42); "Father of Years" (ROST 1958: 42); "Father of Years" (DAHOOD 1965: 49); "Father of the (place) *Šunem*" (DELCOR 1968: 301); "Father of the Luminaires" (OLDENBURG 1969: 17); El, the father of the Kassitic god *Šnm* (JIRKU 1970: 278f); "Father of Years" (CROSS 1973: 16); El, the father of the Kassitic god *Šnm* (GORDON 1976: 261f); *šnm* = name of the abode of El (AISTLEITNER 1955: 5); *qrš mlk ab šnm* = "district of the king a[nd] the father: the *šnm*" (*ibid.* 1967: Stw. 2651). The following should be added to this list: "Father of the Exalted Ones" (SCHMIDT 1966: 23, n. 4; KEARNS 1982: 112), and "Father of Years" (DAY 1985: 161).

²¹⁷ Cf. however the criticism by DAY (1985: 163 with ns. 61f that include a short bibliography of scholars that maintain that Baal and El were in opposition to each other and a refutation of that position; cf. also *ibid.* 164), CARAGOUNIS (1986: 41, n. 17), and COLLINS (1993b: 291, n. 118) on the misinterpretation of the Ugaritic and Danielic texts by COLPE, which do not speak of the cessation of dominion and of rivalry (cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 287, n. 80; esp. KEARNS 1982: 87f, n. 9, and pp. 112f; FERCH 1980: 83).

(ibid. 421) was forced to assume that the tradition behind Dan 7 involved a hypothetical phase of a new differentiation into the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" that would account for two distinct beings in the Danielic account.²¹⁸

After a very critical discussion COLPE concluded with caution:

Trotz solcher Einwände scheint die kanaanäische Hypothese aber dem wirklichen Sachverhalt bis auf weiteres am nächsten zu kommen. Die mythographische Ähnlichkeit zwischen dem Verhältnis des Alten der Tage zum Menschensohn einerseits u[nd] dem Verhältnis Els zu Baal andererseits, das sich dem weiteren Befund des Weiterlebens älteren Gutes in isr[aelitisch]–jüd[ischer] Überlieferung ... einfügt, enthält zugleich einen Zshg [i.e., Zusammenhang] von Motiven, welcher den Motivparallelen, auf die sich die anderen Hypothesen stützen, fehlt. Das erlaubt noch am ehesten eine religionsgeschichtliche Filiation (ibid. 420).²¹⁹

Neither HAMMER (1976: 77) nor the French scholar LACOCQUE added significantly new aspects to the Canaanite background hypothesis.²²⁰ Unique, however, was LACOCQUE's argument with regard to the title "Ancient of days" which he equated with the perduration of God when he stated that "at Ugarit as here [in Dan 7], this perduration of God is linked to his enthronement as king and judge" (1976: 108 with n. 10 = ibid. 1979: 143; n. 100).

²¹⁸ Even more difficult in its final analysis is another option mentioned by COLPE (1969: 421). Instead of considering Yahweh with its adapted predicates of El and Baal as background of the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man", COLPE also mentioned the possibility that "the transfer of the predicates", although not provable, could have taken place already in the Canaanite realm rather than later in Israelite thought. Thus the Yahwistic tradition would not be behind Dan 7 but we would have a revived and reinterpreted Canaanite tradition as immediate background. If COLPE has not been misunderstood then one would have not only an unprovable transfer of predicates of El and Baal in Canaanite thought but also a further differentiation into the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" by the author of Dan 7. However, if one thinks of Canaanite influence on Dan 7 it would be much more logical to consider a direct link between El and the "Ancient of days" and between Baal and the "son of man", without any intermediary composite concept such as "El–Yahweh–Baal". This conclusion which excludes Yahweh in the traditio–historical development, was made by COLLINS (1977: 99f; cf. below on p. 68).

²¹⁹ Cf. the criticism of COLPE's ambivalent conclusion: "Paradoxically enough he shows in some detail the untenableness of his hypothesis, but at the end having no other hypothesis to fall back to, he espouses it half-heartedly as the one coming 'closest to the actual facts'" (CARAGOUNIS 1986: 41, n. 17); "Trotz gewisser Schwierigkeiten möchte Colpe die aufgezeigte Hypothese für tragfähig halten. Aber seine eigenen Einschränkungen lassen ziemlich deutlich werden, dass eine Ableitung auf den Vorstellungen über El und Baal problematisch ist" (MÜLLER 1972: 33).

²²⁰ LACOCQUE's specific references were to: (1) the grey hair of the "Ancient of days" and El (1976: 108f = ibid. 1979: 143; ibid. 129); (2) the "son of man" which recalls Baal as vanquisher of the dragon and of Yam and as the enthroned king (ibid.); (3) the epithet, "Ancient of days" originating from the Ugaritic "father of years" (ibid. 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142); (4) the cloud imagery recalling Baal as the "Rider of the Clouds" (ibid. 1979: 146, n. 121). HAMMER (1976: 77) only mentioned El as aged deity with grey hair and Baal killing the dragon Itu thereby establishing his kingship.

The most detailed traditio–historical and religious–historical study on the Canaanite background of Dan 7 was put forward by KEARNS. The starting point of KEARNS' (1982: 27) tradition–history on the second part of the vision of Dan 7 is a brief footnote by COLPE (1969: 418, n. 118) remarking that possibly behind the *nomen proprium* "Baal" the proper name "Hadad" stood. Taking up this notion, KEARNS extended the proposed Canaanite tradition–history of Daniel further back by stressing that the proper name Baal should only be regarded as the epithet of the god Hadad (1982: 58–71)²²¹ who is already mentioned as subordinate god in the pantheon of Ebla from the 24th and 23rd century and whose earliest ethnic association can be traced back to the Amorites in Syria in the 19th century (ibid. 32f). KEARNS argued that the Ugaritic Baal myth could not be the ultimate origin of Dan 7²²² but has to be considered only as a 14th century epic version of a Hadad–related cultic–mythic tradition complex dating back to the beginning of the 19th century,²²³ whereby the main actor Hadad is called by his epithet Baal (ibid. 65).²²⁴ In

²²¹ According to the tradition complex of Hadad, El was the king of the assembly of gods, while Hadad, subordinate to El, was the ruler over the assembly of gods. Thus, it is Hadad's position that accounts for the epithet "Lord (*b'el*)" (of the gods). By the 14th century Hadad's epithet was so dominant, that it practically superseded the name Hadad (ibid. 60–62).

²²² Cf. ibid. 85, n. 1: "Als C. Colpe ... die kanaanäische Hypothese aufstellte ... griff er, um das ursprüngliche Traditionsgefüge zu erfassen, auf das aus Ugarit stammende Baalepos zurück. Sein Resultat war mager ... Trotz der durch dieses Resultat aufgezwungenen Vorbehalte meinte Colpe, dass die kanaanäische Hypothese 'dem wirklichen Sachverhalt bis auf weiteres am nächsten kommt. Dieses vorläufige Ergebnis muss vertieft werden. Es reicht aber nicht aus, lediglich Traditionselemente aus dem ugaritischen Baalepos unkritisch heranzuziehen, sondern man muss von einer sachgemässen Bestimmung des Inhalts des Traditionsgefüges um Hadad ausgehen."

²²³ Tracing back the Hadad–Yam battle to the beginning of the second millennium has repercussions on the similar Marduk–Tiamat tradition of the *Enuma Elish* epic. LAMBERT (1965: 295f) explained the theme of a conflict between a deity and the sea as of Amorite origin that was introduced as the Amorites settled in Babylonia (on the influence of the Amorites see already C.T. CLAY in 1919 as cited by SHEA 1977: 40). Furthermore, "the *Epic of Creation* is not a norm of Babylonian or Sumerian cosmology. It is a sectarian and aberrant combination of mythological threads woven into an unparalleled compositum. In my opinion it is not earlier than 1100 B.C." (LAMBERT 1965: 291). LAMBERT was followed by JACOBSEN (1968: 107) in regard to the western origin of the deity–sea monster battle motif, however, he differed from LAMBERT in dating the *Enuma Elish* to 1400 B.C.E. (ibid. 1976: 189f; cf. TSUMURA 1989: 48, n. 18). TSUMURA (ibid. 49) and KEARNS (1982: 88 with n. 10; cf. also pp. 33f) followed LAMBERT and JACOBSEN's position of a western origin of the general motif of the conflict of a storm–god with the sea. In the particular case of the conflict motif in the *Enuma Elish* in 1988 LAMBERT revised his earlier position in so far as that he now assumes northern Mesopotamian traditions as direct predecessors (TSUMURA 1989: 48 with n. 17) but maintained the date of about 1100 B.C.E., which is also favored by HUTTER (1996: 45).

²²⁴ KEARNS characterised this ancient cultic–mythic tradition complex of Hadad as having a fixed relationship between Hadad, El, Yam, and Anat, which included certain requisites as well as certain mythic events (1982: 85). The mythic events are: (1) Yam revolts against the assembly of gods led by El; (2) Hadad fights Yam and destroys him; (3)

regard to the evidence for such an ancient tradition complex of Hadad, KEARNS stated:

Die Grundstruktur dieser kultisch–mythischen Hadadtradition ist vornehmlich durch eine sekundäre Entwicklung erkennbar. Spätestens am Anfang des 2. Jahrtausends entstand eine dichterische Fassung der Hadadtradition. Diese wurde unter Zugrundlegung der kultisch–mythischen Hadadtradition ausgebildet, ist aber keine getreue Wiedergabe derselben, sondern ist durch Gesetzmässigkeiten der dichterischen Erzählkunst gekennzeichnet. Eine unkontaminierte Version der dichterischen Hadadtradition ist nicht erhalten. Dagegen sind aber vier verschiedene Verwertungen vorhanden, aus denen man ihren Hauptinhalt erschliessen kann (ibid. 85f).

These four utilisations of the poetic Hadad tradition are, according to KEARNS (ibid. 86–90): (1) The first part of the 14th century Ugaritic Baal epic, i.e., the battle between Hadad and Yam (CTA 1 and 2);²²⁵ (2) the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* (between 1500–1100)²²⁶ replacing Hadad with Marduk;²²⁷ (3) the Hurrian myth of Ullikummi from the 16th/15th century whereby Hadad is replaced by Teshub, the Hurrian storm-god;²²⁸ (4) the Egyptian *Story of Astarte* from the 14th century, replacing Hadad with Seth.²²⁹

However, the only reliable²³⁰ witnesses for the reconstruction of the details of the ancient cultic–mythic tradition complex of Hadad are, according to KEARNS: (1) allusions and citations of the Hadad tradition in the Ugaritic Baal epic; (2) allusions in some Amarna letters; (3) the *Phoenician History* by Philo of Byblos; (4) Old Testament passages relating to Yahweh; (5) Canaanite elements in the tradition of Seth of Avaris; and (6) the Greek myth of Typhon and Zeus (ibid. 92–96).

In regard to the relationship of the Hadad tradition to Dan 7 KEARNS concluded:

Die Apokalyptik, sofern sie die Hadadtradition betrifft, ist durch eine Eschatologisierung des um Hadad geformten kultisch–mythischen Traditionsgefüges gekennzeichnet. Der ontologische Horizont dieser Eschatologisierung war nicht die vorfindliche, geschichtliche Welt, sondern eine transzendente Sphäre, die als eschatologische Grösse noch aussteht. Das kultisch–mythische Traditionsgefüge wurde in einen transzendental–eschatologischen Äon ver-

Hadad is awarded with the rule over the assembly of gods (ibid. 91). On the unclear role of Anat see ibid., n. 25.

²²⁵ Text: GINSBERG 1969: 129–131 (CTA 1 and 2 = VI AB and III AB B, III AB C, III AB A).

²²⁶ TSUMURA 1989: 48, n. 18.

²²⁷ Text: SPEISER 1969a: 60–72 and GRAYSON 1969a: 501–503.

²²⁸ Known from its Hittite translation, “The Song of Ullikummi”, from the 14th century. Text: GOETZE 1969: 121–125. Cf. also the reference to “The Song of Ullikummi” by BEASLEY–MURRAY 1983: 46 and below n. 238 on p. 66.

²²⁹ Text: WILSON 1969a: 17f. A more distant version of the Hadad tradition is according to KEARNS (1982: 90 with n. 23) the Greek Perseus–Andromeda saga.

²³⁰ Inconclusive according to KEARNS (ibid. 92 with ns. 27f) are iconographic evidence and stele inscriptions.

legt und wurde damit zum apokalyptischen Traditionsgefüge. Der Anlass zur Eschatologisierung der Hadadtradition ist ungeklärt (ibid. 98f).²³¹

Apart from the origin of the Hadad tradition and its relationship to Dan 7, KEARNS argued for parallels between the Hadad tradition and the following Danielic expressions:

(1) “coming with the clouds of heaven” (ibid. 102–107);²³² (2) “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed” (ibid. 107f);²³³ (3) the “glory” or the radiant aura (“Schreckensglanz”; Aram. יָקָר; Akk. *melammu*) of the eternal king²³⁴ (ibid. 108–111);²³⁵ (4) the

²³¹ The proposed reformulation of the Hadad tradition into an eschatological, apocalyptic version was assessed by COLLINS (1993b: 292 = ibid. 1993a: 132) as “extremely hypothetical” because it is inferred from Jewish texts and is not attested in any pagan source.

²³² KEARNS discussed especially the following biblical texts in connection with the frequently cited Ugaritic epithet of Baal “Rider of the Clouds”: Psa 68:5; Deu 33:26 (cf. below n. 235); Isa 19:1; Psa 104:3; 18:11//2 Sa 22:11; Psa 68:33.

²³³ KEARNS linked the Ugaritic formula *tqh.mlk 'lmk drkt.dt drdrk* (CTA 2 IV 10), “You shall receive your eternal kingdom, your dominion (endures from) generation (to) generation” with its two key words *mlk* מלכות (“kingdom”) and *drkt* שלטון (“dominion”) by way of Psa 145: 13: “Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endures throughout all generations” (מלכותך מלכות כל עולם וממשהלך בכל דור ודור) to Dan 3:33: “His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation” (מלכותה מלכות עם דר ודר), Dan 4:31: “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation” (שלטנה שלטן עם דר ודר), Dan 6:27: “His kingdom shall never be destroyed, and his dominion shall be to the end” (מלכותה די לא תחבל ושלטנה עד סופא), and Dan 7:14 “His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed” (שלטנה שלטן עם די לא יעדה ומלכותה די לא תחבל).

²³⁴ “And to him was given dominion and *glory* and kingdom” (ולא יהיב שלטן ויקר ומלכו).

²³⁵ KEARNS tentatively interpreted this term as a reflection of a not-directly-attested Hadad tradition which also appears in other passages of the Old Testament as the Hebrew term נְאוּת (“majesty”) in conjunction with עֶז (“power”): (1) Psa 93:1: “The Lord reigns; he is robed in majesty; the Lord is robed, he is girded with strength” (יהוה מלך נאות לבש יהוה עז התאזר); (2) Deu 33:26: “the one who rides through the heavens to your help, and in his majesty on the clouds” (רכב שמים בעזרך ובנאותו שחקים) corrected by CROSS/FREEDMAN (1947: 6, 7) to the following original text without *matres lectionis*: רכב שמים בעז רכב בנאות שחקים “the one who rides [through] the heavens with his power, the one who rides in [his] majesty on the clouds” (KEARNS 1982: 103f, n. 58); (3) Psa 68:35: “Ascribe power to God, whose majesty is over Israel, and his power is in the skies” (תנו עז לאלהים על ישראל נאותו ועז בשחקים). KEARNS noted that Deu 33:26 uses besides נאות/עז also the formulas “the one who rides through the heavens” (רכב שמים) and “the one who rides on the clouds” (רכב שחקים) and Psa 68:33, 34 in conjunction with נאות/עז the phrase “the one who rides in the heavens, the ancient heavens” (רכב בשמי שמי קדם). Psa 93 is next to נאות/עז also associated with additional elements from the Hadad tradition (cf. below n. 236).

relationship between the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” (ibid. 112–119),²³⁶ and (5) the phrase “son of man”.²³⁷

²³⁶ The relationship between El and Hadad is described by KEARNS as follows: “In der Sache des Königtums sind El und Hadad auf einander bezogen. El ist König im statischen Sinn, dass er König war und König bleiben wird. Hadad unterscheidet sich von El, indem er seine Königsherrschaft erwirbt. Durch den Sieg über Jamm wird das Königsein Els nicht ausser Kraft gesetzt, sondern der Sieg Hadads endet in einem Nebeneinander von El und Hadad, beide mit königlicher Würde. El ist *mlk* ‘König’. Hadad *mlk* ‘übt die Königsherrschaft aus’. El ist der Urgrund der Königsmacht, dagegen ist Hadad der bevollmächtigte Gebieter, der die Ausübung der Königsgewalt innehat. El ist der Oberkönig, Hadad sein Vasall” (ibid. 112f). It is this relationship of two divine beings – El superior to Hadad, the latter after his victory over Yam installed as king and carrying out the kingly power in the assembly of gods – which KEARNS saw reflected in the Dan 7:13, 14 where the “son of man” receives eternal kingship from the “Ancient of days”. Three passages from the Psalms were cited by KEARNS that reflect the Hadad tradition in this respect and serve as links to the apocalyptic text: (1) Psa 82:1: “Yahweh stands in the assembly of God; in the midst of the gods he judges” (אלהים נצב בעדת אל בקרב אלהים ישפט) was understood by KEARNS as Elohistically edited, therefore he replaced Elohim with Yahweh. In a further step this meaning was explained by KEARNS as an interpretation of an underlying Hadad tradition that would have read: “Hadad stands in the assembly of El; in the midst of the gods he reigns”; (2) The next passage adduced was Psa 93:1–4 which exhibits according to KEARNS the following elements of the Hadad tradition: (a) Psa 93:1a: “The Lord is king/the Lord has become king”; (b) Psa 93:2: Yahweh’s reign is everlasting (מעולם); (c) Psa 93:3: The rebellion of the sea; (d) Psa 93:4: Since Yahweh is described as being mightier than the sea the underlying conclusion is that his kingship is the result of his victory over the sea; (3) The last linking passage is Psa 29:10: “Yahweh sits on the flood and Yahweh sits as King forever” (יהוה למבול ישב וישב יהוה מלך לעולם); cf. KTU.101,1–2: *b’l jtb k tbt gr hdr [] k mdb* “The Lord sits, like a throne [is] the mountain, Hadad [] like a flood” (ibid. 117, n. 128) reflecting the victorious Hadad who sits on Yam and is installed as eternal king.

²³⁷ KEARNS’ starting point for his tradition–historical elaboration of this issue is the shift from Canaanite to Aramaic which occurred when the Hadad tradition was handed down. While in Canaanite dialects the epithet “Baal” was understood as the appellative “Lord”, the Aramaic consonantal equivalent בעל provided an additional divergent meaning, i.e., “husband”. Thus, using the same consonantal word in Aramaic as in Canaanite would have become a source of misunderstanding. Therefore, KEARNS proposed a translation based on the *meaning* of the appellative “Lord” rather than the employment the same consonantal word in Aramaic with its semantic ambiguity. The Aramaic semantic equivalent to the Canaanite בעל was according to KEARNS ברנש (ibid. 72f). KEARNS (1978: 16–88) argued that the origin of the Aramaic ברנש is the Ugaritic *bns* (“royal vassal”) which developed into the Aramaic ברנש whereby the meaning shifted from “royal vassal” to “lord” and finally resulted by pseudo-etymology in בר אנשא. Cf. however the criticism of this hypothetical development by COLPE (1981: cols. 375–378), HUEHNERGARD (1987: 47), KVANVIG (1988: 492, n. 58), and COLLINS (1993b: 304, n. 242). In fact KEARNS had to admit that “der historische Vollzug des Übergangs vom kanaanäischen zum aramäischen Epitheton ... nicht erfassbar [ist] ... Historisch sichtbar ist lediglich das Endresultat” (1982: 73). As a single instance for such a result KEARNS (ibid. 75, n. 306) cited a late rabbinical text, *pKil 31c47* that mentions the Aramaic epithet ברנש דטור “Lord of the field” which is also attested in its Canaanite form בעל שר from Ugarit (KTU 4.183,1; ibid., n. 302). From this evidence KEARNS concluded: “In die

After KEARNS' detailed study, the remark by BEASLEY–MURRAY (1983: 46f), who was inclined to see the Ugaritic Baal cycle as only one significant background for Dan 7 while also considering similarly patterned myths,²³⁸ was considerably more modest. BEASLEY–MURRAY "postulated that the original figure [for the "son of man"] was the storm god, common to many Semitic religions, and that his place in the vision was due to his playing the traditional role of conqueror of the sea monster" (ibid. 55).

In his book on God's conflict with the dragon and the sea, DAY discussed Dan 7 under the heading "The eschatologization of the divine conflict". When one takes the main thrust of his book into account, his forceful argument for a Canaanite background of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 comes as no surprise. DAY basically followed EMERTON, repeating the long-known arguments without adding significant new aspects.²³⁹ In regard to one of the basic problems of the Canaanite background, i.e., its transmission history, DAY (1985: 165f) took up EMERTON's conjecture²⁴⁰ that the alleged²⁴¹ Israelite enthronement festival served as transmitter

Eschatologisierung des Traditionsgefüges um Hadad wurde auch das im kultischen Bereich verwurzelte Epitheton einbezogen. Es erscheint sowohl in reichsaramäischer pseudoetymologischer Umsetzung als *br'nš* [Dan 7:13] als auch in dem nur durch Zwischenglieder mehrerer Übersetzungen erhaltene *homo* [4 Ezr 13:5]" (ibid. 79). Cf. however the criticism by COLLINS (1993a: 132 = ibid. 1993b: 292; ibid. 291, n. 116) due to the hypothetical character of this conclusion.

²³⁸ Referred to were the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* and the Hittite "The Song of Ullikummi" (BEASLEY–MURRAY 1983: 46).

²³⁹ The arguments put forward were: (1) based on the presupposition that the description of the "Ancient of days" as having white hair indicates an old man (contra see JUNKER 1932: 52, HAAG 1993a: 164; ibid 1993b: 58) DAY again resurrected the criticised and reluctantly cited parallel to the Ugaritic term *'ab šnm* by basically following the line of argument put forward by CROSS (1973: 16, n. 24) without advancing new convincing arguments to silence the doubt about this parallel (see also above p. 60 with n. 216 and below n. 256, no. 1 on p. 70); (2) both El and the "Ancient of days" are judges (DAY 1985: 161); (3) the "son of man" comes with the clouds of heaven and Baal is known as "Rider of the Clouds" (ibid. 161f); (4) the kingship of the "son of man" follows the destruction of the sea monsters, as Baal is assured the kingship by defeating Yam (ibid. 162); (5) the relationship between the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" is best reflected in the relationship between El and Baal (ibid. 162f). In addition to these usually-cited parallels a further link was proposed by DAY (ibid. 167, 177) by equating the "son of man" with the angel Michael and tracing this angelic figure back to the Canaanite god Baal. To support a Canaanite link to the angel Michael, DAY argued that according to Jewish apocalyptic there existed seventy angelic princes (Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan on Deu 32:8; 1 En 89:59ff; 90:22ff), one for each nation. This view is according to DAY a reflection of the Ugaritic belief that the consort of El, Asherah, had seventy sons (CTA 4 VI 46). DAY furthermore argued: "As for Michael, the chief of the guardian angels of the nations, he too should be derived from one of the sons of El, indeed he should be El's supreme son. This points in the direction of Baal, the chief and most active of the gods under El ... The angel Michael therefore has his ultimate origin in Baal ..." (1982: 175f).

²⁴⁰ "One question remains. If, in the early monarchy, Yahwe was subordinated to Elyon in the Jerusalem cultus, how was the tradition of two divine beings transmitted to the author of Daniel? Amid so much uncertainty and so many conjectures, no answer can be given

of the Canaanite mythological theme of the divine conflict with the dragon.²⁴² From this position DAY argued that:

the gap in dating that has to be bridged is not therefore between the Ugaritic texts in ca. 1350 B.C. and the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., but the end of the kingdom in 586 B.C., when we know such syncretistic beliefs existed, and the writing of the book of Daniel in 165 B.C., i.e., *just* [my emphasis] over four centuries (ibid.).

No new arguments were brought forward by GOLDINGAY (1988: 151),²⁴³ REID (1989: 85–87),²⁴⁴ and J.L. CRENSHAW (1992: 371).²⁴⁵

The most sustained discussion of a Canaanite background for the second part of the vision of Dan 7 was made by COLLINS over a period of almost twenty years. After a brief reference to a Canaanite background of the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” (COLLINS 1975: 601), a more detailed discussion followed in 1977. According to COLLINS “the clustering of images which we find in Daniel 7:9–14 can only be understood directly against a background of Canaanite myth” (ibid. 1977: 99). As his predecessors had done, COLLINS listed the commonly-cited parallels²⁴⁶ without referring to COLPE’S criticism of the epithet “father of years” and the parallel to the white hair of the “Ancient of days” (cf. above p. 60). But as COLPE had

which claims anything more than the possibility. It must suffice to show that the transmission of such a tradition was not impossible” (EMERTON 1958: 241f).

²⁴¹ DAY (1985: 165) stated that “it is commonly accepted by scholars that the theme of the divine conflict with the dragon, with which the kingship of Yahweh was associated, had its *Sitz im Leben* at this festival, even by those who prefer not to speak of it as an Enthronement Festival”. Cf. this statement with the following by COLLINS (1993b: 289f): “Emerton supposed that the Canaanite traditions had been transmitted in Israel in connection with the festival of the enthronement of Yahweh, which ‘was probably an adaptation of a pre-Davidic Jebusite rite.’ This part of his thesis has not won support ...”.

²⁴² DAY (1985: 166) also gave room for COLLINS’ explanation that learned scribes transmitted Canaanite myths (cf. below p. 68).

²⁴³ Only one specific parallel was addressed, and this one with reluctance, namely, the alleged correspondence between the titles of El and the “Ancient of days”. Taking up COLLINS’ proposed explanation of how these Canaanite thoughts have been transmitted (cf. below p. 68), GOLDINGAY concluded: “In recapitulating this old ritual pattern, Dan 7 may then have its own links with these ancient myths, via learned circles in Judaism rather than because they lived on in the temple cult” (GOLDINGAY 1988: 151).

²⁴⁴ REID followed COLLINS in regard to the title of the “Ancient of days” (a position however abandoned in the meantime by COLLINS; cf. above p. 60 and below p. 70 with n. 256, no. 1) and pointed out that the depiction of the “Ancient of days” as an aged figure and high god indicates similarity to El (cf. also his reference to Zeus below in n. 360 on p. 107). In regard to the “son of man” he followed the position of EMERTON.

²⁴⁵ Crenshaw compared the “Ancient of days” with the Ugaritic *’ab šnm*.

²⁴⁶ (1) Baal, the “Rider of the Clouds” and the “son of man” coming in the clouds of heaven; (2) the white-haired El and the “Ancient of days” with hair like cleanest wool; (3) El’s title “father of years” recalls the “Ancient of days”; (4) El presides over the heavenly council as the “Ancient of days” presides over a divine council; (5) El is judge as is the “Ancient of days” (ibid. 1977: 100f); (6) the conferral of kingship of the “son of man” derives from Baal’s enthronement (ibid. 105).

already pointed out, COLLINS also acknowledged that "the central problem of this imagery is the presentation of the 'one like a son of man' who comes 'with the clouds of heaven'" (ibid. 99f), i.e., that in the Old Testament the superior Yahweh is associated with clouds, while in Dan 7 a subordinate divine being is associated with this same imagery. Although some attempts were made to prove a subordinate position of Yahweh to El Elyon,²⁴⁷ COLLINS dismissed them, stating: "The idea that there is another God superior to Yahweh is foreign to the OT" (ibid. 100). Thus "nowhere in the OT is Yahweh juxtaposed with another heavenly being in the way the 'one like a son of man' and the 'Ancient of Days' are juxtaposed here [in Dan 7]" (ibid.). From this follows that COLLINS, in contrast to COLPE, did not consider an intermediate Yahwistic background as viable but held that "the imagery of Yahweh riding on the clouds is itself derived from the storm-imagery of the theophanies of Baal" (ibid.).²⁴⁸

Thus, in contrast with the first part of the vision which COLLINS linked to Old Testament imagery (influenced by Canaanite mythology), the motifs of the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man" "can not be derived from the OT, but presupposes independent mythological traditions. These traditions are best represented by the Ugaritic texts from the second millennium B.C." (ibid. 101). A significant handicap of this position are the postulated "independent mythological traditions" that have to be assumed in order to close the gap between the Ugaritic texts and the author of Dan 7.²⁴⁹ Furthermore, COLLINS faced not only a problem in transmission history but also the recognition that "we have [also] no solid evidence as to how or in what form the traditions represented by the Ugaritic texts were available in the second century B.C." (ibid. 102).²⁵⁰

The following suggestions were made by COLLINS: (1) although it was perceived as problematic, he argued that the enthronement scene might indicate the survival of a Canaanite-influenced royal cult in Jerusalem as folk tradition or in learned circles. The same has to be assumed for the "Ancient of days" and "son of man" imagery (ibid. 102); (2) the translation of the ancient *Phoenician History* by Philo of Byblos from about the end of the first century C.E. shows that "ancient Canaanite lore was accessible in the Roman period" (ibid.); (3) there is evidence for a general "interest in old traditions throughout the Hellenistic world" (ibid.).²⁵¹

Although COLLINS acknowledged that it is still uncertain how the author of Dan 7 got hold of the Canaanite material he allegedly used, "there is not reason, however, to doubt that ancient traditions closely related to the Ugaritic myths were available in the second century B.C." (ibid. 104.).

²⁴⁷ Cf. EISSFELDT 1956b: 29f; see also n. 211 above on p. 59.

²⁴⁸ Cf. also end of n. 218 on p. 61.

²⁴⁹ Cf. also KEARNS 1982: 28, n. 121.

²⁵⁰ The same point was of course also realised by COLPE (1969: 240), which prompted him to propose a Yahwistic link between the Canaanite origin and the Jewish Apocalyptic, a proposal that is very difficult to maintain (cf. above p. 60 and n. 218).

²⁵¹ COLLINS (1977: 102f) mentioned the copying of Babylonian kingship myths and rituals, the copying of a Sumerian lament for Uruk, and Berossus' translation of the Babylonian cosmogony in the Hellenistic period. Furthermore, he referred to the Egyptian Oracle of the Potter from the Hellenistic period which harks back to 1991 B.C.E.

In addition to pointing out parallel features between Dan 7 and Ugaritic texts, COLLINS (ibid. 105f) also established a mythic pattern in Dan 7, focusing on the confrontation between the powers of chaos and the opposing heavenly beings, which can be tabulated as follows:²⁵²

<i>Ugaritic text</i>	<i>Dan 7</i>
a) Revolt of the sea demanding the surrender of Baal and kingship over the gods	a) Revolt of the sea through beasts rising from it
b) Defeat of the sea by Baal	b) –
c) Manifestation of Baal's kingship	c) Final kingship of the "son of man"

Very different is the destruction of the enemy: In the Ugaritic text the sea is defeated in battle, in the Danielic text a divine judgement scene is held which is followed by the destruction of the beasts from the sea (ibid. 105).²⁵³

COLLINS' (1993a: 125–128, 131–135 = ibid. 1993b: 286–294) recent article, particularly the commentary section on the religio-historical background of Dan 7, did not add significantly new aspects²⁵⁴ with the exception of a reference to KEARNS' (1982: 46–57) study which according to COLLINS demonstrates "the continued vitality of the cult of Baal Hadad, the Baal of the Ugaritic texts, into the Christian era". There is however a lack of cultic texts to "fill out the traditions associated with the cult in the later period" (ibid. 1993a: 132 = ibid. 1993b: 191f)²⁵⁵

²⁵² A recent formulation of the pattern of relationship is the following: "What is important is the pattern of relationships: the opposition between the sea and the rider of the clouds, the presence of two god-like figures and the fact that one who comes with the clouds receives everlasting dominion" (ibid. 1993a: 128 = ibid. 1993b: 291). Cf. also MOSCA (1986: 508) who presented the following similar pattern: "(1) Baal's battle with the Sea, which leads to the proclamation of the storm god's kingship; (2) Baal's kingship, which is, and must be, sanctioned by El; and (3) El's own kingship, which is not thereby undermined." Again another pattern has been put forward by BEASLEY-MURRAY (1983: 46): "Thus the pattern of *threat* from the sea monster, *assembly* of the gods, *deliverance* by the storm god, and his consequent exercise of *sovereignty* is clear."

²⁵³ It has to be noted that the Danielic account has more facets than COLLINS mentioned here. Thus, the sentence of the judicial assembly is not spelled out, it is solely the fourth beast that is slain and burned, while from the remaining beasts only their dominion is taken away and their lives prolonged for a limited time (cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 303f).

²⁵⁴ He repeated that the "general analogy in context" is "the conflict for universal kingship" (1993a: 126). Furthermore, the subordination of a divine being to the "Ancient of days" "has no precedent in the biblical tradition. It is quite intelligible, however, against the background of Canaanite mythology, where Baal appears in subordination to El" (ibid. 127). Descriptive parallels are: (1) Baal's epithet "Rider of the Clouds" and the coming of the "son of man" with clouds; (2) the portrayal of El as an aged god and the exceptional description of God in Dan 7 in this way; (3) the epithet of El as "judge" and the judicial role of the "Ancient of days"; (4) the divine council of El and the multitude mentioned with the throne scene in Dan 7 (ibid.).

²⁵⁵ References to the cult of Hadad from the rise of the Aramaeans down to the Byzantine period include the name of Hadad in stele inscriptions, treaties, temple dedication inscriptions, various literary notes, its usage as theophoric names of rulers, iconographic

thereby not solving the basic problem of the transmission of the Canaanite tradition to the Jewish apocalyptist of Dan 7. Noteworthy is also the support for COLPE’s reluctance to cite the epithet “father of years” as a true parallel for the “Ancient of days” (ibid. 1993a: 127 = ibid. 1993b: 290; cf. also p. 60 of this study).²⁵⁶

witnesses, place names, its association with specific cult sites (KEARNS 1982: 40–57) but lack cultic texts.

²⁵⁶ Critical remarks against a Canaanite influence include the following (cf. also n. 49 on p. 13):

- (1) The “Ancient of days”: (a) the Ugaritic expression *ʿab šnm* has been criticised as an “untenable parallel” to the “Ancient of days” (GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; cf. also COPPENS 1968: 500; FERCH 1980: 82; GOLDINGAY 1988: 151; KVANVIG 1988: 508) and in fact has even been abandoned by the most outstanding supporters of a Canaanite background (COLPE 1969: 419f; KEARNS 1982: 173f, n. 402; COLLINS 1993a: 127 = ibid. 1993b: 290; cf. also above p. 60 and n. 216 on p. 60); (b) El as “judge” is only mentioned once in the Ugaritic texts (CROSS 1973: 21) whereby the translation of *il ḫp* is disputed. The assembly of gods mentioned in the same passage depicts El with his consort and Hadad who is singing and playing on the lyre while the messengers of Yam demand Baal, thus a context that “hardly parallels to the judgement scene of the apocalyptist” (FERCH 1980: 83);
- (2) The “son of man”: (a) There is no specific allusion to Baal (KVANVIG 1988: 508); (b) according to the Ugaritic myth “Baal not only triumphs over Yam and Mot but also dies at the hand ... of Mot. Baal’s death finds absolutely *no parallel in a demise of the S[on of]M[an]*” (FERCH 1980: 81); (c) Baal vanquished Yam but nothing similar is said about the “son of man” (KVANVIG 1988: 508; COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 23; CASEY 1979: 37; cf. also n. 49, no. 7b on p. 13); (d) the use of clouds associated with Baal does not fit the “son of man” but rather Yahweh (COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 23); (e) the “son of man” is not a divine figure thereby introducing “a second deity into the monotheistic faith of Israel” (CASEY 1979: 37), cf. however the response by DAY (1985: 166f): “M. Casey misunderstands Emerson ... [who] is alluding to the pre-history of Dan. 7”;
- (3) The conferral of kingship to the “son of man”: (a) GESE (1983: 380, n. 16) warned to correlate the Ugaritic enthronement of Baal with the “son of man” since this would traditio-historically be impossible against the background of the falling-away of the El-Baal confrontation in the Iron Age and its replacement by the “Zeuswerdung” of Baal, i.e., Baal Shamem; cf. ODEN 1977); (b) the ultimate conferral of kingship upon Baal after the outcry of Astarte “Yamm is indeed dead! Ba‘al shall be king” (*ym./mt b‘Im ymlk*; DRIVER 1956: 82, III*A, l. 32) is according to FERCH “by no means certain” (1980: 83–85; cf. also KOCH 1980: 234); (c) even if Baal should have received kingship, such a feature is not specifically Canaanite (KVANVIG 1988: 508); (d) the enthronement of the “son of man” is similar to that of a “terrestrial king because the Son of Man takes over kingship after four previous terrestrial kings (v. 17), and because the kingship is political rather than cosmical (v. 14)” (ibid.); (e) it is “an impossible thought for a Jew” (ibid. 351, n. 24) that Yahweh should confer *his* kingship, therefore it must be “the kingship given to the rulers on earth” that is conferred to the “son of man”. “Accordingly the Ugaritic myth would communicate something entirely different from the vision, and the reason why the composer would interpret his reality in the light of this myth is hard to explain” (ibid.); (f) Baal has nothing to do with the rule over people, nations, and languages nor with an eschatological investiture (KOCH 1980: 234); (g) the ascension to power by the “son of man” is not

3.3. Iranian influence

According to J.M. SCHMIDT (1969: 51) the thesis of Iranian influence on Dan 7 can be traced back to J.A.L. RICHTER's work "Das Christentum und die ältesten Religionen des Orients", published in 1819.²⁵⁷ But it would take another eighty years before scholarly interest focused with all its intensity on the possibility of an Iranian influence on Dan 7. While RICHTER perceived the whole seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel to be influenced by Persian ideas, the interest of the studies of the *religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* of the early twentieth century centred basically on the Danielic figure of the "son of man". However, the focus of these studies was not in the first instance the interest in the Danielic "son of man" as such. The effort of the *religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* in the first decades of last century was directed towards establishing the origin of the Gnostic *Erlösermythus*.²⁵⁸ The central figure of this myth was the so-called *Urmensch*, or Primordial Man.²⁵⁹

realised by conquest but given by Yahweh who himself accomplished it (COPPENS 1968: 500, n. 23);

- (4) The relationship of the "Ancient of days" and the "son of man": (a) a supreme god as old in relation to a younger god is a widespread phenomenon (KVANVIG 1988: 508); (b) an alleged rivalry between the young Baal and the old El as background of Dan 7 was not only rejected by critics such as FERCH (1980: 83) as a misconstruction but also dismissed by supporters of the Canaanite school (cf. n. 217 on p. 60);

Against the background of the above-mentioned criticism FERCH concluded: "Even granting the proposed creative freedom claimed for the writer of Daniel 7, it is pointedly apparent that the author has changed the scenes of Canaan beyond recognition. One would not want to press for parallels of all details for no scholar affirms this. Yet, so many modifications have to be assumed that there would be no difference between proposing an extremely fertile creativity of the apocalypticist and a discontinuity between Ugarit and Daniel 7" (ibid. 86; cf. also KVANVIG 1988: 508 in regard to a "strongly transformed" and "scarcely recognizable" background). COLLINS responded with an enlightening statement to this forceful attack that silenced with a single stroke almost all criticism when he stated: "The pattern of the relationship here is more important than the variation in detail" (1981: 93; cf. also below p. 69 and n. 252). Recently, CARAGOUNIS (1986: 41, n. 17) followed up this argument when he remarked: "All they [who assume a *religionsgeschichtlichen* background] are interested to show is patterns of thought common to the Ancient Near East. But when the matter is put like that, it becomes obvious that relevance to Daniel is lost."

²⁵⁷ SCHMIDT (1969: 51, n. 83) quoted RICHTER (p. 205) as follows: "Es [i.e., Daniel chapter 7] hebt besonders die Persische (*sic*) Idee hervor: dass vor dem Beginn des Lichtreiches das Böse erst noch herrschend sein werde, spricht dann von der hohen Gewalt, welche Gott dem Logos, (denn dieser ist unstreitig v. 13 unter des Menschen Sohn zu verstehen, der Adam Kadmon der Kabbalisten) über alles Sichtbare verliehen habe, und zuletzt vom Weltgerichte und dem Beginne des Lichtreiches, womit nach Kap. XII. 2 zugleich die Auferstehung der Todten (*sic*) verbunden ist."

²⁵⁸ The following presentation on the Iranian influence on Dan 7 can only take up the basic results without tracing their research history in detail, which is "confused" (KEARNS 1982: 4), "obscure", "intricate" (ibid. 5) and "one of the most curious and difficult chapters in the whole history of comparative religions study" (BORSCH 1967: 75) that involves a risk aptly expressed by COLPE: "[Man kommt] leicht vom Hundertsten ins Tausendste und erliegt schliesslich der komplizierten Quellenlage" (1961: 6f). For a detailed over-

Ground-breaking in the quest for the origin of the *Urmensch* was **R. REITZENSTEIN**’s study *Poimandres* in which he among other things attempted to isolate a Hellenistic myth with the god ἄνθρωπος, which was understood as a late development of the *Urmensch* (1904: 81–110). Tracing this motif back, REITZENSTEIN ultimately considered a Persian origin for the concept of the *Urmensch* (ibid. 109). It was obvious that further genealogical studies of the *Urmensch* would consider the Danielic “son of man” as a Jewish variant of the Primordial Man, which shifted this concept from *Urzeit* to *Endzeit* (KEARNS 1982: 18). The attempt to identify the *Urmensch* in Iranian traditions resulted in the following proposals:

W. BOUSSET argued in the first edition of his book *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* that the Danielic “son of man” is a result of the merging of the Jewish Messiah and a pre-existent heavenly being, i.e., the *Urmensch* (1903: 253f = ibid. 1906: 306f = BOUSSET/GRESSMANN 1926: 267f). In his quest for the origin of the concept of the *Urmensch* BOUSSET in the same publication briefly mentioned the Iranian figure of *Gayomart* (1903: 346–349 = ibid. 1906: 405 = BOUSSET/GRESSMANN 1926: 352). In a later work in the context of the origin of the *Urmensch* (BOUSSET 1907: 160–223) a more detailed study of *Gayomart* was made by BOUSSET (ibid. 202–209) in which he remarked that *Gayomart* is derived from *Gaya maretan* (“mortal life”) (ibid. 202), which is related to “a still more primitive conception called *Gaya*” (BORSCH 1967: 76). According to the Pahlavi *Bundahishn* 24:1, *Gayomart* was created as the “first of the human species” (BOUSSET 1907: 206). As a righteous man he suffered innocently and finally died. But at the end of time it is said in *Bundahishn* 30:7 that “first the bones of *Gayomart* are raised up” (ibid. 205).²⁶⁰ According to BOUSSET from this Persian background the concept of the *Urmensch* spread and was also adapted by Jewish apocalyptic:

Auch in der jüdisch-apokalyptischen Literatur ist der Urmensch ... eine bekannte Figur ... Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach hat aber bereits Daniel die Gestalt des himmlischen Menschen gekannt und sie künstlich erst in seinem berühmten siebenten Kapitel als Symbol des israelitischen Volkes umgedeutet (ibid. 196).

BOUSSET was followed by **KRAELING** (1927: 85–94, 102, 109, 141–151, 159f 164) who argued that the *Gayomart* myth travelled via Babylon to Palestine combining in this process *Gayomart* with *Marduk* which became the prototype for the “son of man”. Despite many problems, **BAUMGARTNER** (1939: 222) tentatively considered *Gayomart* as the possible origin of the “son of man”. A late supporter of *Gayomart* as ancestor of the Danielic “son of man” was **G. WIDENGREN** (1969: 474).

view and criticism of the research history see especially COLPE 1961. For more recent summaries see e.g. BORSCH 1967: 55–88; 132–173; KEARNS 1982: 3–29.

²⁵⁹ “The Primordial Man is the cosmos itself, thought of in human form, the macrocosm conceived of in terms of microcosm” (MOWINCKEL 1956: 423; cf. also COLPE 1969: 416).

²⁶⁰ For summaries on *Gayomart* cf. KEARNS 1982: 18f; BORSCH 1967: 76–78; COLPE 1961: 140–170; MOWINCKEL 1955: 420–431; KRAELING 1927: 128–165; VON GALL 1926: 409–419.

A close *Gayomart*-related predecessor for the "son of man" was proposed by A. CHRISTENSEN²⁶¹ who argued on the basis of *Bundahishn* 30:7, 9²⁶² that if the eschatological "son of man" derived from *Gayomart*, he had to be understood as a prototype of the human genre who also embodied eschatological functions. When these eschatological functions were referred to, then *Gayomart* was called *Saoshyant*. In a further development after the Israelites had adopted *Gayomart*, his eschatological functions were detached and associated solely with the independent figure of *Saoshyant*, the counterpart to the Danielic "son of man" (1917: 33f). Another scholar who considered *Saoshyant* the eschatological counterpart of *Gayomart* as ancestor of the "son of man" was VON GALL (1926: 409–430).²⁶³

A different forerunner for the "son of man" had been put forward by GRESSMANN in 1905. He suggested that the Indo-Iranian king of paradise *Yima* (*Yama*)²⁶⁴ was (1905: 290–292, 361–363)²⁶⁵ the original figure for the "son of man". In 1906 BOUSSET incorporated *Yima* in his theory of the *Urmensch* and considered *Yima* as a possible predecessor²⁶⁶ of *Gayomart* by stating: "Man wird sich daran erinnern müssen, dass auch in der persischen Religion der Urmensch und zwar in der doppelten Gestalt des Gayomarth und des bereits indoiranischen Yima eine gewisse Rolle spielte" (1906: 407 = BOUSSET–GRESSMANN 1926: 355).²⁶⁷ Bousset

²⁶¹ *Saoshyant* was also mentioned by BOUSSET (1903: 477; *ibid.* 1907: 203), CLEMEN (1909: 120), MOWINCKEL (1955: 423), and WIDENGREN (1969: 475) although they did not make a specific case for *Saoshyant* but only mentioned him together with *Gayomart* to whom he is closely related.

²⁶² "First, the bones of Gâyôpard are roused up, then those of Mâshya and Mâshyôî, then those of the rest of mankind; in the fifty-seven years of Sôshyans they prepare all the dead, and all men stand up; whoever is righteous and whoever is wicked, every human creature, they rouse up from the spot where its life departs" (30, 7); "Of the light accompanying the sun, one half will be for Gâyôpard, and one half will give enlightenment among the rest of men, so that the soul and the body will know that this is my father, and this is my wife, and these are some other of my nearest relations" (30, 9) (WEST 1880: 123).

²⁶³ "Der 'Menschensohn', von dem die Evangelien und eine Anzahl noch näher zu bezeichnender Schriften reden, ist nichts anderes als der Urmensch. Diese Gestalt stammt aus dem parsischen eschatologischen Ideenkreis, wo er gelegentlich mit ... dem sieghaften *Saošyant* ... gleichgesetzt wurde, ist mit den parsischen religiösen Ideen auch nach Palästina gekommen und hat dort auf die eschatologischen Vorstellungen bestimmter jüdischer Kreise gewirkt" (VON GALL 1926: 409f). Reference to Dan 7 is made by VON GALL on pp. 412f.

²⁶⁴ *Yima* appears in the Iranian Avesta, *Yama* in the Indian Rigveda. BORSCH characterised *Yima* as follows: "Yima is described as the First Man and the first king who once dwelt in an earthly paradise, where he ruled for one thousand years. He, like Yama, is the son of the sun-god *Vivahvant*, and as a royal king is said to shine forth like the sun. As the First Man he was often regarded as the progenitor of the human race. At some point he committed a sin ... and so lost his glory, forfeiting his immortality and that of all his seed. Yet it is said that he will re-emerge from a subterranean place at the end of time" (1967: 79).

²⁶⁵ For the relationship of these two passages see KEARNS 1982: 19, n. 19.

²⁶⁶ Cf. also BORSCH 1967: 79 with n. 2 and p. 81 in regard to *Yima* as possible predecessor of *Gayomart*.

²⁶⁷ Cf. also COLPE 1961: 19.

was followed by C. CLEMEN (1909: 119). A genealogical relationship between *Yima* and the "son of man" was upheld as late as 1953 by G. IBER.²⁶⁸

A *Saoshyant*-related background for the "son of man" was proposed by MEYER when he stated that the Danielic figure represents the amalgamation of the angel *Sraosha* with the saviour *Saoshyant* (1921: 199).

Finally worthy of mention is R. OTTO who assumed that the "son of man"²⁶⁹ is a reflection of the Iranian *Fravashi* – primordial spiritual beings who protect the true righteous – by pondering: "Ist der Menschensohn nicht einfach die *fravashi* (*sic*) des exemplarisch und einzigartig Gerechten ...?" (1934: 342). W. STAERK (1938: 466–476) developed OTTO'S idea further and argued that it was the *Fravashi* of the eschatological *Saoshyant* that was transformed by Jewish eschatology into the angelic "son of man" (ibid. 473).

Half a century after BOUSSET, S. MOWINCKEL (1955: 420–437) still defended the position that the origin of the "son of man" can be traced back to the widespread ancient Near Eastern concept of the Primordial Man, who is a pre-existent, cosmological and eschatological being that is ultimately rooted in Iranian or Indo-Iranian myths. Of course Judaism "was unaware that the Son of Man was really the Primordial Man" (ibid. 436) since this Iranian concept underwent an adaptation to conform to Jewish spiritual structures. Particularly worth mentioning in this regard are the identification of the *Urmensch* with the Messiah, his purely eschatological nature, and the lack of any "cosmogonic foundation" (ibid. 435). However, these features were not adapted in a uniform fashion throughout the various Jewish circles. Noteworthy in this regard is the Danielic "son of man", who was not associated with the Messiah but used as a symbol for the people of Israel (ibid. 433f). Thus MOWINCKEL – the last significant supporter of the Iranian *Urmensch* movement – concluded this era not very convincingly by stating:

we certainly cannot point to any single one of the many variants of the Anthropos myth as the only source and the direct source of the idea of the Son of Man. Everything suggests that the Jews acquired their knowledge of these myths and conceptions from many quarters, in many varying forms, and at different periods (ibid. 431).²⁷⁰

Apart from these various proposals for an Iranian background of the Danielic "son of man", there were other attempts to establish a link to Iranian influence. First to mention in this regard is VÖLTER'S publication which in fact antedated the *Urmensch* movement. According to VÖLTER the Danielic "son of man" in his function as representative of the kingdom of God betrays Iranian dependence. A similar concept of a personified kingdom of god was known in Iranian beliefs in the form of a specific one of the *Amesha Spentas* that were close to *Ahura Mazda*, who acted as the personified *Khshathra vairiya*, the kingdom of god (1902: 173f). VÖLTER

²⁶⁸ G. IBER, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Begriff des Menschensohns im Neuen Testament* (Theological Dissertation, 2 vols.) Heidelberg, n.d. (1953) (cited by COLPE 1969: 441, n. 48; ibid. 1961: 151).

²⁶⁹ OTTO discussed the *Fravashi* in connection with the "son of man" in 1 Enoch.

²⁷⁰ Cf. similar statements by JEFFERY (1956: 451) and BORSCH (1967: 143) and the criticism of CARAGOUNIS (1986: 36–38 and n. 11) for such meaningless generalisations.

(1902: 173) also identified the stream of fire of Dan 7 as a significantly Iranian feature.

Less specific was **A. DREWS** (1910: 10) who stated in rather general terms but with conviction that the whole “son of man” passage betrays “unverkennbar” Persian influence.

MEYER perceived only the judgement scene in Dan 7 as originating from Iranian ideas. He emphatically stated that “der uralte Gott ... keiner anderer (ist) als Ahura-mazda” (1921: 199) and saw in the stream of fire a reference to the Zoroastrian judgement. **VON GALL** (1926: 267f) followed **MEYER**’s Iranian interpretation.

As did many other scholars of the *religionsgeschichtlichen Schule* of the first three decades of last century, **GRESSMANN** traced the “son of man” motif in Dan 7 back to Iranian origins, particularly to *Mithras* (1929: 343–365, 365–373).²⁷¹ It was the Iranian syncretistic *Volksreligion* of the Achaemenid period that accounted for the origin of the Danielic “son of man” motif. In Babylon Iranian *Volks Glaube* fused with Chaldean religion to form an Iranian–Babylonian syncretism which in turn also became available to the Jews (ibid. 351–353). Part of the Iranian–Babylonian syncretism was also the fusion of the sun-gods *Ahura Mazda* and *Shamash* with *Mithras*, which explains the latter’s future role as sun god (ibid. 357f). **GRESSMANN** concluded²⁷² that the “Behauptung, dass der Menschensohn ursprünglich der Sonnengott sei, nicht als unmöglich gelten [kann], und die Hypothese von dem iranisch-babylonischen Ursprung dieses Sonnengottes darf ernste Beachtung beanspruchen, mag er nun Mithras, Ahura Mazda oder sonstwie geheissen haben” (ibid. 358), whereby **GRESSMANN** favoured *Mithras*.²⁷³

Following **MEYER** and **VON GALL**, **KRAELING** also held that “the figure of the ‘Ancient of Days’ is clearly fashioned after the Persian Ahura-mazda” (1933: 229) but added that the prototype of the “son of man” was the post-Babylonian Marduk “that was adjusted to Persian environment and in which Ahura-mazda, who has replaced Marduk as chief god, conferred upon the latter the sovereignty over Babylonia” (ibid. 230). The title “son of man” was explained along the lines of C.H. **KRAELING**, who held that it “goes back to the Iranian Gayomart, who was fused with the Marduk figure in Babylonia and became the primeval champion” (ibid.).

Last to be mentioned is **E. SELLIN** (1933: 130) who considered it very likely that the “Ancient of days”, the stream of fire, the opened books, and the beasts coming out of the sea were derived from non-Jewish oriental mythology, although he was

²⁷¹ A number of elements of this view were already mentioned in **GRESSMANN** 1925: 17–19 (cf. also below p. 78).

²⁷² On the basis of: (1) an enthronement scene in a hymn by Claudianus, dated to around 400 C.E., which supposedly contained ancient Iranian themes (**GRESSMANN** 1929: 353f); (2) the equation of the Enochian righteous scribe with the “son of man” (ibid. 355f; cf. also 350); and (3) the identification of the “son of man” in 4 Ezr 13 with the sun-god (ibid. 356, 358).

²⁷³ “Stammt er (i.e., the ‘son of man’) aus der iranischen Religion und ist er ursprünglich mit Mithras identisch, so begreifen wir die weite Verbreitung der Vorstellung vom Urmen-schen in der Zeit des Gnostizismus ... wir treffen ihn bei den Parthern und Meder, bei den Chaldäern, ... bei den heidnischen Phrygern und christlichen Nassenern ... Denn überall bewegen wir uns auf dem Boden der Mithrasreligion ...” (ibid. 1929: 364).

not able to decide whether these motifs were of purely Zoroastrian origin or an amalgamation with Babylonian elements.²⁷⁴

²⁷⁴ Critical remarks against an Iranian influence include the following (cf. also n. 63 on p. 19):

Apart from more general remarks that (a) the evidence for an Iranian background is not compelling (LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = *ibid.* 1979: 143; GESE 1983: 380; GOLDINGAY 1988: 150f); (b) the "Persian material itself is difficult to date and parallels are rarely specific to Persia" (*ibid.* 151); (c) there is no overall single Iranian background that could account for all aspects of Dan 7 (BAUMGARTNER 1939: 220; COLLINS 1993b: 283), the following more detailed objections have been made:

- (1) *Urmensch*: (a) almost all features of the *Urmensch* are lost in the "son of man" (OTTO 1934: 335f; JANSEN 1939: 102); (b) the conferral of dominion has no specific parallel in the Primordial Man (BAUMGARTNER 1939: 22); (c) the difference between the two is far greater than their similarity (MÜLLER 1972: 32f); (d) the Gnostic *Urmensch* has nothing to do with the Jewish apocalyptic "son of man" (COLPE 1969: 417; DAY 1985: 158); (e) "diverse conceptions have been too easily fused together into the supposed myth of the Primordial Man"; (COLLINS 1993b: 283); (f) the Danielic "son of man" has no protological function (*ibid.*);
- (2) *Gayomart*: (a) no eschatological role is assigned to *Gayomart* (STIER 1934: 121; BAUMGARTNER 1939: 222; COLPE 1969: 411); (b) the "son of man" is the eschatological judge, *Gayomart* is the defeated in battle (JANSEN 1939: 101f); (c) if *Gayomart* embodied not only a protological but also an eschatological role, it would be unexplainable why on the one hand its Jewish protological counterpart, i.e., Adam, did not appear in the *Endzeit*, and on the other hand the Iranian eschatological figure, Saoshyant did not come into view in the *Urzeit* (COLPE 1969: 411; cf. also DELCOR 1968: 307f); (d) even if *Gayomart* would have embodied an eschatological role, it would only relate to being the first of the resurrected, but would not involve the conferral of dominion (COLPE 1969: 411); (e) the proposed Jewish counterpart to *Gayomart* is an artificial composite portrait based on Dan 7, 4 Ezr, and the *Similitudes of Enoch* which has no historical validity (COLLINS 1993b: 283); (f) *Gayomart* is no real parallel to Dan 7 (*ibid.*);
- (3) *Saoshyant*: (a) is not identical with *Gayomart* (CHRISTENSEN 1917: 32–34; COLPE 1969: 411; KOCH 1980: 411); (b) he is a terrestrial saviour in contrast to the heavenly "son of man" (COLPE 1969: 411); (c) and has no real parallel to Dan 7 (COLLINS 1993b: 283);
- (4) *Yima(Yama)* is contemporary with every generation and is not judge over all mankind (COLPE 1969: 411);
- (5) *Fravashi*: (a) Enoch and his "son of man" are not a unity as the Iranian concept of the man and his *Fravashi* (*ibid.*); (b) if the *Fravashi* are adduced they would only fit the "son of man" in Enoch not Dan 7 (BAUMGARTNER 1939: 220; COLPE 1969: 411); (c) parallels are only coincidental (JANSEN 1939: 102); (d) the *Fravashi* do not have an eschatological–judicial role (COLPE 1969: 411);
- (6) The judgement: (a) There is a marked difference between the concept of the judgement in Jewish and Iranian thought. The former emphasises collective, national and political aspects while the latter is the dualistic struggle of the world powers whose outcome is determined individually on the basis of merit and guilt (JUNKER 1932: 46); the heavenly judgement is not only attested in Iranian thought but also in the Old Testament, Babylonia, and Ras Shamra (BENTZEN 1937: 33 = *ibid.* 1952: 61);
- (7) The opened books: (a) books mentioned in connection with judgement is not specifically Iranian but also found in the Old Testament (JUNKER 1932: 47; BENTZEN

3.4. Indian influence

In his discussion on the concept of incarnation in Hinduism **J. GRILL** (1902: 346–349) pointed out the repeated references to the descents of the god *Vishnu* and his later appointment as highest god at which he took the character of *Nārāyaṇa*, a concept from Brahmanism. In his explanation of the meaning of *Nārāyaṇa*, he noted that its connotation is “der Menschenartige, Menschenähnliche”, indicating in a footnote reference that the *Petersburger Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* already with reference to Dan 7:13 translated *Nārāyaṇa* as “Menschensohn”. *Nārāyaṇa* as its Vedic name *Purusha*, served “zur Bezeichnung der Welt, des Universums, als des höchsten Wesens, des Absoluten, indem der Makrokosmos (*sic*) nach Analogie des Mikrokosmos (*sic*) angeschaut wurde” (ibid. 348).²⁷⁵

One year after GRILL’S remarks **O. PFLEIDERER** also mentioned in a lecture on the early Christian perception of Christ in the light of religio-historical sources, a parallel between Indian religious concepts and the Danielic “son of man”. He noted that the pre-incarnate heavenly being of Buddha was called “Mensch” (*Purusha*) or “grosser Mensch” (*Mahapursha*) (1903: 24), but cautioned about a too-specific relationship because a historical dependency between the Buddhistic “Grossen Menschen” and the Danielic “son of man” cannot yet be proved.²⁷⁵

In his quest to unravel the myth of the *Urmensch*, of which the Danielic “son of man” is but one variant, **BOUSSET** (1907: 209–215) went beyond an Iranian background and ultimately traced this motif-complex back to Indian origins. The corresponding figure to the *Urmensch* is in this instance not *Gayomart* but *Purusha*.²⁷⁶ What survived only in traces in Iranian mythology (cf. ibid. 205) is found according to BOUSSET in the Indian Rigveda in much clearer language, namely, that the world stems from the body of the killed *Urmensch* (ibid. 210).²⁷⁷

1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61) and Babylonian thought (ibid.); (b) Iranian books played no role in the final but only in the individual judgement (JUNKER 1932: 47);

- (8) The stream of fire: (a) fire is known in Old Testament theophanies (ibid. 1932: 52; BENTZEN 1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61) and as capital punishment (ibid.); (b) in Iranian eschatology a person dies by fire, in Dan 7 only the corpse is burned (JUNKER 1932: 54); (c) the Danielic stream of fire has no eschatological-judicial function as the Iranian counterpart (Kearns 1982: 189, n. 476).

²⁷⁵ “Wieweit zwischen jener indischen Lehre von den Inkarnationen (Avataren) des ‘Grossen Menschen’ in den erleuchteten Lehrern oder Buddhas der verschiedenen Epochen und diesen jüdisch-christlichen Lehren vom himmlischen Menschen eine geschichtliche Abhängigkeit bestehe, ist zur Zeit noch nicht ausmachbar ... [so] müssen [wir] uns daher vorläufig darauf beschränken, nur die tatsächliche Parallele zwischen dem buddhistischen ‘Grossen Menschen’ und dem jüdisch-christlichen ‘Menschensohn’ zu konstatieren, ohne eine geschichtliche Abhängigkeit behaupten zu dürfen” (PFLEIDERER 1903: 25f).

²⁷⁶ *Purusha* was also mentioned by SCHMIDT (1926: 346f) in his article on the “son of man”. However *Purusha* was not mentioned in connection with Dan 7 but was referred to in the discussion of the “son of man” in the New Testament.

²⁷⁷ Without referring to Dan 7 in particular DREWS (1910: 53) also connected the Messiah with Indian traditions by pointing out that Krishna, the incarnation of Vishnu, was also persecuted after his birth. In regard to critical voices for an Indian background of Dan 7 there is no direct criticism mentioning Dan 7 since the discussion is usually connected to

3.5. Astrological influence

Already in 1903 ZIMMERN (SCHRADER/ZIMMERN/WINCKLER 1903: 392) pointed in a brief reference to the possibility that Marduk was associated with the Babylonian Zodiac of Taurus, which therefore could have provided the original background for the “son of man”.²⁷⁸ JEREMIAS (1916: 630) followed ZIMMERN but opted for Nebo instead of Marduk. He was also convinced that the ancients knew the cosmic–astrological meaning of the vision of the “Ancient of days”, since astrologers liked to depict the heavenly “Greis” (old man) with a scale in his right hand and the “Book of Destiny” in his left.

An interpretation of the “son of man” scene based on Babylonian astral mysticism and uranography was given by EISLER (1930: 665–671), which provided him also with an explanation for almost every detail of the second part of the vision (cf. also p. 16 with n. 53).²⁷⁹ In line with Targumic and Midrashic etymological references, EISLER also made a historical interpretation of Dan 7 based on the phrase “with the clouds of the heaven”. EISLER pointed out that one Anani from the house of David (1 Chr 3:24) was believed to become the Messianic king to come with the clouds of heaven (ibid. 668f). According to EISLER (ibid. 670f) Jews in the Diaspora in Babylon were working towards a rebellion against Antiochus IV Epiphanes and tried to win the Davidic Anani²⁸⁰ with the help of the oracle of Dan 7 as the leader of their liberation movement.

Four years before GRESSMANN published his lengthy treatment of Dan 7 (cf. pp. 75, 79) in 1929 he had already outlined the main line of thought for a Babylonian–Iranian background of Dan 7 in his book *Die hellenistische Gestirnsreligion*. However, in his earlier treatment, in accordance with the topic of his book, he repeatedly stressed the astrological background but with no specific statements

the wider issue of the *Urmensch* and a real connection could not be established. However in this regard, OTTO (1934: 337f; JANSEN 1939: 102) pointed out that the Indian god *Purusha* out of which the world was created is not the same as the *Urmensch*.

²⁷⁸ “Da nun Marduk bei den Babyloniern wol (*sic*) im Sternbild des Stiers lokalisiert (*sic*) war ..., so könnte sehr wol (*sic*) dieses Sternbild oder ein in unmittelbarer Nähe befindliches (Fuhrmann? Orion?) für den Ursprung des ‘himmlischen Menschen’ in Betracht kommen.”

²⁷⁹ (1) The thrones were explained as “die silberglänzenden ‘Prachtwagen’ der Planeten, auf denen sie bei besonderen Gelegenheiten – wenn sie zugleich in ihrem Hypsōma, in ihrem ὄριον und in ihrem οἶκος stehen – zur Feier dieser Stunde Platz nehmen” (EISLER 1930: 665); (2) the “Ancient of days” was interpreted as the Babylonian Zodiac “Greis”, i.e., the Greek Perseus (ibid. 666); (3) the stream of fire was understood as the milky way passing by the Zodiac of Perseus (ibid.); (4) “die tausend mal Tausende ‘Zehntausend mal Zehntausende’, die dem ‘Alten der Tage’ dienen, sind unzählige Sternchen, die in der Milchstrasse noch einzeln unterscheidbar sind” (ibid.); (5) the open book was related to the Zodiac of the “Tablet of Destiny” or “Tablet of the Heaven”, i.e., the writing tablet of Nebo (ibid. 666f); (6) the death of the fourth beast was connected with the Zodiac “of the dead man” (ibid. 667), and (7) the “son of man” was traced back to the Zodiac “Anthropos” as it occurs in Teucer’s list (ibid.).

²⁸⁰ Dated around 190 B.C.E. by EISLER (ibid. 669).

(GRESSMANN 1925: 17–20).²⁸¹ In his later treatment of Dan 7 the astrological background did not appear.

3.6. Greek influence

Greek influence on the second part of Dan 7 was even less favoured than its influence on the first part.²⁸² To be mentioned is A. KALTHOFF (1904: 76) who argued that the “son of man” can be explained only against the background of Platonic ideas. The “son of man” “ist der urbildliche, der Idealmensch, der aus der unsichtbaren oberen Welt in diese niedere Welt der Sichtbarkeit herabkommt, um in ihr eine ewige Herrschaft aufzurichten” (ibid.).²⁸³

3.7. Egyptian influence

While GRESSMANN proposed two different Iranian backgrounds for Dan 7 (cf. pp. 73, 75), he also advanced an Egyptian explanation for the origin of Dan 7 (1929: 403–409).²⁸⁴ GRESSMANN based much of his Egyptian interpretation on the Egyptian daily cycle of the sun (1929: 404). The various phases of the sun, and in particular the Egyptian deities associated with them, were set in correlation with various elements of Dan 7.²⁸⁵ Thus the sun setting, i.e., Atum, was set in parallelism with the “Ancient of days” (ibid.). The flying aspect of the “son of man”²⁸⁶ was explained as pointing back to the Egyptian god Horus, who was associated with the flying sun-disk (ibid. 407) and described as a “handsome youth” (ibid. 404). In addition he set the rising sun in contrast with the setting sun, i.e., Atum, by pointing to the “Ancient of days” who hands over his rule to the younger “son of man” (ibid. 404). The Danielic aquatic enemies GRESSMANN likewise set in relation to the Egyptian sun-cycle by pointing to the sun-god in his bark (ibid. 408). Elaborating further on the sun-god travelling in his bark in the netherworld GRESSMANN

²⁸¹ An exception is the reference to the seven planetary gods who accompany the god of destiny which GRESSMANN (1925: 20) compared to the judgement scene of Dan 7 with the “Ancient of days” and the multitude standing before him (cf. also JUNKER 1932: 49, n. 1).

²⁸² On the Greek influence on the “son of man” imagery cf. however now the forthcoming article “Die Tiere und der Mensch in Daniel 7” by O. KEEL to be published in KEEL/STAUB 2000. It is based on the lecture “Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft der danielischen Tiersymbolik und der apokalyptischen Metaphorik” held on the occasion of the interdisciplinary colloquium “Europa, Tausendjähriges Reich und Neue Welt – Zwei Jahrtausende Geschichte und Utopie in der Rezeption des Danielbuches” at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, from 15 – 18 March 2000.

²⁸³ Cf. also the references to Zeus below on p. 107 with n. 360.

²⁸⁴ For an explanation of this contradictory position cf. KEARNS 1982: 24, n. 104.

²⁸⁵ With this reference to the daily cycle of the sun GRESSMANN anticipated somehow MORGENSTERN’S (1961: 71f) theory of the cyclic appearance of the Tyrian sun-god (cf. below p. 80).

²⁸⁶ GRESSMANN referred in the first instance to the “son of man” in 4 Esra but also implied the Danielic “son of man”.

concluded: “Wenn diese Kombination richtig ist, so würde man den ägyptischen Sonnengott, das Vorbild des Menschensohnes, weder als Re²⁸⁷ noch als Horus, sondern als Osiris bezeichnen, den Herrscher der Toten” (ibid. 409). In following up this idea GRESSMANN pointed out that Egyptian *judgement scenes* are often associated with Osiris (ibid.). Finally, the Danielic books were reason enough for GRESSMANN to see also the figure of a scribe implied in the original background. GRESSMANN (ibid. 405) identified this scribe with the Egyptian god Thot, the deputy of Re and the judge of heaven, which particularly suited the Danielic judgement scene.²⁸⁸

3.8. Tyrian influence

A Tyrian background of the “son of man” motif was proposed by J. MORGENSTERN (1961: 65–77). Based on an earlier study on the religion of Tyre (1960: 138–97) MORGENSTERN noted that Tyre adopted a solar religion in the 10th century. According to MORGENSTERN the deified sun existed in two reciprocal phases. “The one phase was that of the sun of the autumnal and winter half of the

²⁸⁷ The function of Re was not clearly demarcated by GRESSMANN. The above statement is the only clear passage that compares the “son of man” with Re (so understood by COLPE 1969: 412). Another passage that might indicate a similar equation states that the sun-god is called “Horus Behedti ... schöner Jüngling, der am Morgen geboren wird; er ist Re in der Mittagszeit, Atum, wenn er niedersteigt zum Untergangsberg” (GRESSMANN 1929: 404). Since GRESSMANN compared the “Ancient of days” with Atum, the setting sun, and Horus, the rising sun, with the “son of man”, Re the midday sun in its fullest strength would rather point to the *youthful* “son of man”. But in the following passage GRESSMANN equated the abdicating Atum with Re only to conclude: “Die Gestalt des *Hochbetagten* geht zurück auf den *Greis*, den als Weltkönig aufgefassten Sonnengott der Ägypter, mag man ihn Re, Atum oder sonstwie heissen” (ibid. 405). Likewise he stated: “Ist der Hochbetagte mit Re oder dem Sonnengott identisch, so versteht man, dass er unter dem himmlischen Beamtenstaat einen Schreiber hat, Thot ...” (ibid.). In a last parallel GRESSMANN compared the “Ancient of days” with Re-Harachte and the “son of man” with Horus” (ibid. 407f).

²⁸⁸ Critical remarks against an Egyptian influence include the following: According to BAUMGARTNER (1939: 221) many aspects are noteworthy but not compelling. More critical was JANSEN (1939: 104) who complained that the designation *Menschensohn* is more than incomprehensible since the young sun-god is only god, thereby making the term *Mensch* completely useless. COLPE (1969: 412) stated that the Egyptian hypothesis comes close to the Canaanite one, nevertheless he noted some difficulties: (a) it is necessary to postulate some kind of unity between the “son of man” and the “Ancient of days” since the Egyptian model uses different degrees of age of one Egyptian god, i.e., the sun-god; (b) both Atum and Re abdicate; (c) the *tertium comparationis* “handsome youth” is only attested for Horus and is anyway not essential for the derivation of the “son of man”; (d) Egyptian syncretic identification of sun-god figures and the mutual transfer of their predicates are too varying to identify the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man”; (e) the descriptive Danielic statement “like a man” does not correlate with an animal-headed god. Following this verdict GOLDINGAY (1988: 150) therefore dismissed an Egyptian background as not compelling and COLLINS (1993b: 283) objected that it does not provide an overall explanation for the whole vision.

year ... The other phase was that of the sun of the spring and summer half of the year ..." (1961: 67). In mythological language the first phase at the autumnal equinox was associated with the notion of dying and the entrance to the netherworld. The solar god in this phase was called Baal Shamem. In the second phase at the advent of spring, i.e., the vernal equinox, the solar god appeared rejuvenated as Melcarth. The return of the solar deity was celebrated at the equinoctial New Year's Day in a dramatic ritual enactment by the king of Tyre in the role of the resurrected god. In this enactment the king not only played the role of the god Melcarth but also became a god in human form. In a reciprocal way "Melcarth, in turn, came to be regarded ... as having the appearance and the nature of a man, i.e., as being mortal" (ibid. 72). According to MORGENSTERN, this kind of solar religion was taken over by Solomon, except that "Yahweh was not transformed into a composite deity of two reciprocal forms or phases of being" (ibid. 71) and that "there is some positive evidence that the majority of the kings of Judah ... enacted the rôle of Yahweh as a solar deity in the ritual of the equinoctial New Year's Day festival" (ibid. 72). In regard to Dan 7 MORGENSTERN argued that the same Tyrian solar religion formed the background whereby the old solar god Baal Shamem, corresponding to the "Ancient of days", was replaced by the young god Melcarth, who also possessed the nature of a man, thereby corresponding to the Danielic "son of man".

In a publication that appeared five years later, MORGENSTERN abandoned his Tyrian proposal by stating:

At the time we had complete faith in this thesis and in the arguments and the scientific technique which supported it. Today, however, though only a relatively short time after the publication of that study we find ourselves compelled to reject completely our former interpretation (1966: 64).²⁸⁹

3.9. *Syro-Palestinian influence*

The imagery of the "Ancient of days" was attributed by KEARNS (ibid. 168f) to an independent El tradition that was not connected to the Hadad tradition which he identified as the background for the imagery of the "son of man" (cf. pp. 62–65). KEARNS located this El tradition, some elements of which can be traced back to the 2nd millennium (ibid. 169, n. 381), in southern Syria/Palestine. Since the Hellenistic period witnessed a revival of the El cult in Phoenicia, KEARNS assumed that the El tradition was transmitted via Phoenician religious belief to the author of Dan 7 who merged it with the apocalyptic version of the ancient Hadad tradition to form the "Ancient of days"/"son of man" imagery.

²⁸⁹ Any critical discussion of the Tyrian hypothesis is superfluous after its rejection by the author himself. What remains is to note some acrimonious qualifications such as: "arbitrary" (COLPE 1969: 419, n. 121), "no solid evidence" (COLLINS 1977: 107 with n. 120), "speculative" (KOCH 1980: 234); "conjectural" (DAY 1985: 160); "flabby and whimsical" (CARAGOUNIS 1986: 37, cf. also p. 40, n. 16), and "hardly compelling" (GOLDINGAY 1988: 150).

The following literary²⁹⁰ links between Dan 7 and the proposed El tradition were put forward by KEARNS: (1) the *epithet* “Ancient of days” (ibid. 169–174);²⁹¹ (2) the “Ancient of days” *enthroned* (ibid. 174–178);²⁹² (3) the stream of fire (ibid. 187–190);²⁹³ and (4) the royal servants surrounding the “Ancient of days” (ibid. 190–194).²⁹⁴

²⁹⁰ On the iconographic parallels see p. 108.

²⁹¹ The tradition history of this epithet can be outlined according to KEARNS as follows: The epithet “the Ancient” (*ʾlm*) has its oldest witness in the proto-Canaanite inscription from Sinai *ʾl ʾlm* (“El, this (is) the Ancient”) dated to the end of the 16th or beginning of the 15th century. In Israelite tradition *ʾl* was not understood anymore as name of an independent god but reinterpreted as appellative and *ʾl ʾlm* changed into a noun with adjectival function, resulting in “the eternal God” (Deu 33:27, Gen 21:33; Isa 40:28). As additional evidence for this epithet KEARNS adduced: (a) the Palestinian place name *bt ʾlm* “(city of the) temple of the Ancient” found in the Shishak List from the 10th century; (b) the supposedly pre-Israelite god at Beersheba, *ʾl ʾlm*, which is only mentioned in Hebrew tradition (Gen 21:33); (c) a disputed (cf. ibid. 171, n. 395) Canaanite invocation formula from the Phoenician site Arslan Tash, dated to the 7th century which possibly designates El as *ʾlm*; (d) and late appearances in Punic colonies in North Africa. In order to explain the change from the epithet *ʾlm* to the Danielic *ʾlm* (“Ancient of days”) KEARNS employed the same methodology he used in his explanation of the origin of the phrase “son of man” (cf. above n. 237 on p. 65), namely, the shift from Canaanite to Aramaic. Instead of arguing for a simple continuation of the lexem *ʾlm* in Aramaic, KEARNS pointed out that Aramaic provided a specific expression for a very old man (German: “Greis”), namely, the Syriac *ʾtyq ywmt* (“ancient of days”; another Syriac phrase for an elderly person is *qšyš* [SMITH 1903: 190]). To support this view, KEARNS adduced three references, i.e., the homilies of Aphraates, the Syriac translations for *πρεσβύτερος* in Wisdom of Solomon (2:10) and for *πρεσβύτερος* in Jesus ben Sirach (25:4; Syriac: 25:6; references to Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus ben Sirach were already made by DRIVER [1900: 85]. CHARLES [1929: 181] referred only to Wisdom of Solomon). No equivalent could be given from Palestine. KEARNS concluded: because the epithet “Ancient of days” is not attested in the cultic-mythic Hadad tradition (ibid. 173) the first occurrence in the framework of the Hadad tradition is in its apocalyptic version, i.e., in Dan 7:9. It has to be asked whether the epithet *ʾlm* should indeed be associated with the meaning of a physically old god since it would not harmonise very well with the meaning of an eternal god. In connection with an eternal god KEARNS’ references to *πρεσβύτερος* and *πρεσβύτερος* would include a shift in meaning, because the referred-to Aramaic passages speak about aged *men*. It was exactly such a shift of meaning which KEARNS avoided in his explanation of the origin of the phrase “son of man” (cf. above n. 237 on p. 65). Secondly, the relevant apocryphal references do not associate a god with *ʾlm* which is also a shift of the semantic field (so also LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142). On the issue of the white hair not indicating a decrepit person see LINGERKE 1835: 325; CASPARI 1925: 175ff; JUNKER 1932: 52; JEFFERY 1956: 457; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; HAAG 1993a: 164; ibid 1993b: 58).

²⁹² KEARNS was not able to cite a direct description of the enthroned El in the assembly of gods from the cultic El tradition but had to resort to the poetic Hadad tradition used in the Ugaritic Baal epic (the throne of El is mentioned in connection with the battle of Hadad and Mot [CTA 5 VI 12]). Furthermore, KEARNS cited the following Old Testament passages that were interpreted as adaptations and transformations of the El tradition: the visions of Micaiah ben Imlah (1 Ki 22:19), Isaiah (Isa 6:1), and Ezekiel (Eze 1:26). In ad-

dition to these biblical passages KEARNS also mentioned 1 En 14:18–23. Due to the renewed emphasis of the El tradition in the Hellenistic period the feature of the enthroned god was also used in the formation of the apocalyptic version of the Hadad tradition in Dan 7:9.

- ²⁹³ The specification of El's abode in the Ugaritic formula *mbk.nhrm.qrb.apq.thmtm* ("at the source of the rivers, amid the headwater of the two oceans"; CTA 2 III 4; 3 V 14–15; 4 IV 21–22; 6 I 33–34. Cf. also the same formula in the legend of Aqhat: CTA 17 VI 47f) was attributed by KEARNS to the cultic El tradition which in turn was adapted in Dan 7:10 where streams of fire come forth from the "Ancient of days". KEARNS failed to provide substantial evidence for the qualification of the streams as fire. Since KEARNS could not derive the fire from the El tradition he referred to a depiction of El on a stela from Ugarit, dated to the 13th century which depicts a sun-disk above the enthroned El (PRITCHARD 1969a: no. 493). Based on this observation he interpreted, following GRELOT (1978: 80f) and HERZFELD (1947: 832; cf. also ZEVIT 1968: 393), גלגל in Dan 7:9 not as "wheel" but as a sun-disk transformed into an aureole or several aureoles. Since KEARNS acknowledged that there are no traditio-historical indications that fire was associated with El, he assumed that the sun-disk surrounding El had to be understood as fiery and that the original relationship between the fire and the aureole was transferred in a second step to the throne. Following this line KEARNS proposed an additional transfer to the stream by stating: "Wenn das Traditionselement des Feuers durch den Nimbus in die Eltradition eingegangen wäre, wäre von daher eine sekundäre Übertragung des Feuers auf den Strom denkbar" (1982: 189f).

- ²⁹⁴ The origin of this motif is according to KEARNS the divine council of the cultic El tradition which became part of the ancient cultic-mythic Hadad tradition when the latter was formed. Through the poetic version of the Hadad tradition this imagery was transmitted to the Ugaritic Baal epic (several formulations are used in cultic texts: [1] "the totality of the gods": (a) *pḥr ilm*, CTA 29 II 7; KTU 1.118,28; 1.148,9; (b) *pḥr bn iḥ*, CTA 30, 1–3; 32 I 2,3,9'–9".16,17.25,26.33,34; (c) *pḥr bn ilm*, CTA 4 III 14; [2] "the circle of El": *dr iḥ*, CTA 34,7; 35,16; App. II 17,18; [3] "the circle of the gods": *dr bn iḥ*, CTA 30,1–3; 32 I 2,3,9'–9".16,17.25,26.33,34; [4] "the totality of the assembly": *pḥr m'd*, CTA 2; [5] "the circle of El and the totality of the lord": *dr il w pḥr b'*, CTA 34,7; 35,16; App. II 17,18). Additional references by KEARNS include: (a) the Karatepe inscription from the 8th century mentioning also "the total circle of the gods" (*kl dr bn 'lm*, cf. DONNER/RÖLLIG 1968: 5f, no. 26 III 18, 19); (b) an incantation text from Arslan Tash from the 7th century speaking of "all gods and the great circle of all holy ones" (*kl bn 'lm wrb dr kl qdšm*, ibid. 6f, no. 27, 10–12); (c) a text from Byblos mentioning "the totality of the holy gods of Byblos" (*mḥrt 'l gbl qdšm*), and several Old Testament passages (Psa 82:1; Job 15:8; Jer 23:18; Psa 29:1; 89:7; Deu 32:8 [emended from בני ישראל to בני אלהים; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 494; cf. also above n. 211 on p. 59]; Job 1:6; 2:1; Psa 82:6; 97:7; 89:6, 8; Job 5:1; Deu 33:2, 3; Psa 148:2; 1 Ki 22:19; Isa 6:2). Furthermore the passage in Dan 7:10 has two specific aspects: firstly, the gods are reduced to non-divine beings (cf. also Psa 148:2 which mentions non-divine subordinate beings), secondly the specific formulation "a thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him" cannot be derived from the Old Testament (cf. 1 En 14:22 for a similar formulation: μύριαι μυριάδες ἐστήκασιν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) which prompted KEARNS to attribute it to the El tradition.

3.10. Vision of the Netherworld

Comparing the “Death–Dream of Enkidu” and the “Vision of the Netherworld” with Dan 7,²⁹⁵ KVANVIG (1988: 455) noted the following parallels in the *structure of content* that relate to the second²⁹⁶ part of the Danielic vision:

Sequences	Features		
	D ²⁹⁷	K	E
1. God on the throne	God on the throne	God on the throne	God on the throne
	Description of the god	Description of the god	–
	Surroundings: Fire, attendants	Surroundings: Fire, attendants	–
2. Judgement	The supreme god as judge	The supreme god as judge	The supreme god as judge
	Read from a protocol		Read from a protocol
	Accusation: Rebellion	Accusation: Rebellion	Accusation: Rebellion
	Accused: rebel king	(Accused: rebel king)	–
	Judgment: Annihilation in fire	(Judgment: Annihilation)	–
3. The ideal ruler	Designation: Man	(Designation: Man)	–
	Style reflects enthronement	Style reflects enthronement	–
	Universal and everlasting kingdom	Universal and everlasting kingdom	–
	Style indicating future	Style indicating future	–

The parallels for *words* and *phrases* were listed as follows (ibid. 456):

	D	K	E
1.	“Thrones were set in place”	–	–
2.	“An Ancient took his seat” (v. 9)	“The warrior Nergal was seated on a royal throne” (l. 51)	“(resided) the queen of the nether world, Ereshkigal” (l. 50)
3.	“His throne flames of fire and its wheels burning fire; a river of fire streamed out and went out from before him” (v. 9)	“(From) his arms lightning was flashing” (l. 52)	–

²⁹⁵ For an introduction to KVANVIG’s proposal see p. 23.

²⁹⁶ For the parallels relating to the first part of the vision see pp. 24–26.

²⁹⁷ D = Dan 7; K = “Vision of the Netherworld”; E = “Death–Dream of Enkidu”.

4.	"Thousands upon thousands served him and myriads upon myriads were standing before him" (vs. 9, 10)	"The Anunnaki, the great gods, were kneeling at his right and at his left side ... The underworld was filled with fear and it lay prostrate before the son of princes" (ls. 52B–53A)	–
5.	"The court sat" (v. 10)	–	–
6.	"... books were opened" (v. 10)	–	"Belet-Šeri, the scribe of the netherworld, kneeling before her (Ereshkigal), holding a tablet, she reads out before her" (ls. 51, 52)
7.	"The beast was killed and its body destroyed, it was given to the burning fire" (v. 11)	"Suddenly, the fearsome sheen of his terrible kingship shall annihilate you completely" (l. 67B)	–
8.	"... one like man" (v. 13)	"One man" (<i>ištēn eflu</i>) (l. 50)	–
9.	"Dominion and glory and kingdom were given to him" (v. 14)	"... the exalted shepherd: whom my father ..., the king of the gods gives full responsibility" (l. 62)	–
10.	"... all peoples, nations and tongues shall serve him" (v. 14)	"... whom (the <i>ištēn eflu</i>) from east to west he (the god) allows to look over the lands in their totality ..., and the (<i>ištēn eflu</i>) rules over everything" (l. 63)	–
11.	"His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, his kingdom such as shall never be impaired" (v. 14)	"... in all eternity" (l. 64)	–

KVANVIG assessed the parallels between the "Vision of the Netherworld"²⁹⁸ and the description of the enthroned "Ancient of days" as corresponding in the basic imagery, but admitted that the correspondences in phraseology are not as close as in the first part of the Danielic vision and conceded that "other sources can have influence [on] Dan 7 in this sequence just as much or even more than the Akkadian vision" (1988: 457). The only similarity in the description of the judgement is that "in both texts the judgement comes over the supremely wise rebel king" (ibid. 458). In regard to the correspondence with the "son of man" KVANVIG observed analogies in style rather than direct phraseology, i.e., "both texts describe how the supreme god transfers universal kingship to a ruler" (ibid.). But he added that:

²⁹⁸ No assessment of the parallels between the second part of the Danielic vision and the "Death–Dream of Enkidu" was made by KVANVIG, only an overall judgement for the complete "Death–dream of Enkidu"; cf. above n. 81 on p. 26.

if it could be made clear that the Akkadian *ištēn eflu* which is used about the king within the Akkadian vision corresponds to Aramaic *bar ʿnāš* which is used about the ruler in Dan 7 within the vision, this would be a fairly decisive argument for a relationship between the texts (ibid.)

KVANVIG (ibid. 416–419) thus analysed the expression *ištēn eflu* “one man” in several similarly patterned dream accounts²⁹⁹ and proposed a threefold semantic value which he also established for *בר אנש* in Dan 7:13 (ibid. 496–502):

	<i>Vision of the Netherworld: ištēn eflu</i>	Dan 7: <i>בר אנש</i>
Gattungs-pattern	The unique man in a dream experience who mediates between the gods and men	A transcendent figure, appearing in a vision as manlike, who acts as a messenger from God to man
Structural pattern	One man or human being in contrast to the underworld-gods, the monsters	Used to contrast with the preceding beasts
Descriptive pattern	The ideal king designated as “the exalted shepherd”	A royal designation for the shepherd ³⁰⁰ of the nations

KVANVIG concluded:

There can be no other conclusion that the phrases *bar ʿnāš* and *ištēn eflu* do not only carry the same meaning generally, but that within Dan 7 and the Vision of the Nether World they function according to exactly the same semantic patterns. No other texts are known where this specific combination of semantic patterns occurs (ibid. 502).

Finally, mention must be made of KVANVIG’s explanation for the missing motif of the cloud in the “Vision of the Netherworld”. He explained the separated Danielic motifs of the four winds (v. 2) and the cloud (v. 13) as originally having been a single unit similar to Eze 1 that were associated with “the supreme god surrounded by his attendants, and the coming of a divine figure in a theophany” (ibid. 513). In Mesopotamian mythology the thunder-cloud and the four winds were personified and embodied by the Anzu-bird, the same bird to which the *ištēn eflu* “one man” is likened in the “Vision of the Netherworld”. This corresponds to the Danielic “son of man” whose “entrance is heralded by the four winds of heaven and he comes with the clouds of heaven” (ibid. 514).³⁰¹

²⁹⁹ First dream of Gilgamesh (GRAYSON 1969b: 504, tab. V, B 1–9); second dream of Gilgamesh (SPEISER 1969b: 82f, tab. V, col. i, 21–21, iii, 37–43); first dream of the Righteous Sufferer (BIGGS 1969: 598, tab. 3, 8–12); second dream of the Righteous Sufferer (ibid. 598f, tab. 3, 21–44), a dream of Nabonidus (OPPENHEIM 1969: 309f, col. vi); and the Death-Dream of Enkidu (SPEISER 1969b: 87, tab. 7, col. iv, 11–54) (KVANVIG 1988: 415).

³⁰⁰ KVANVIG (ibid. 499f) followed PORTER 1983 (cf. above p. 22).

³⁰¹ The following critical remarks against an influence from the “Vision of the Netherworld” have been put forward (cf. also n. 82 on p. 26):

(1) The description of Nergal in the Akkadian text does not correspond to the “Ancient of days” with the exception of the lightning flashes (LUCAS 1990: 170);

3.11. Old Testament influence

In comparison to the first part of the Danielic vision there is a clear difference in the use of the Old Testament³⁰² as instrument to explain the tradition–history of the second part. First of all, the discussion of this section is dominated by a single issue, i.e., the “son of man”. Second, it is significant that although extensive research has been done on this subject, many discussions about the “son of man” that refer to the Old Testament are not concerned with the tradition–history but rather with the interpretation or identification of the “son of man”. Third, it is noteworthy that in the second part there is no extensive use of the Old Testament by supporters of a mythological background to underline the transmission and reflection of mythological concepts into biblical tradition.³⁰³ Lastly, the Book of Ezekiel, particularly chapter 1, has to be added in the second part of the vision to those proposals that argue for an overall Old Testament background of Dan 7 (cf. pp. 32–35).

The procedure followed to outline suggested Old Testament influences on the second part of the vision will comprise a brief discussion of various traditio–historical explanations of the “son of man”, which is followed by a summary on the role of the alleged Israelite enthronement festival in the formation of Dan 7 and by proposals that hold that the Old Testament is the main contributor for the whole second

-
- (2) In VAT 10057 the visionary is judged and spared, in Dan 7 the beasts are judged and lose their dominion or in the case of the fourth beast the verdict is destruction (ibid.; COLLINS 1993b: 285 = ibid. 1993a: 130; DAY 1985: 159); the accused which is not explicitly mentioned in the “Vision of the Netherworld” “does not display any similar defiance” as its Danielic counterpart (ibid.);
 - (3) The recipient of dominion “over all” is not clear or probably a ruler who is already dead (LUCAS 1990: 170f; COLLINS 1993b: 285 = ibid. 1993a: 130; cf. also DAY 1985: 159f). The phrase “forever” refers to “the celebration of the New Year Festival as Aššur will continue for ever” (LUCAS 1990: 170) and “in no case is the Assyrian king given everlasting dominion” (COLLINS 1993b: 285 = ibid. 1993a: 130; ibid. 1993b: 291 = ibid. 1993a: 131);
 - (4) “... the parallels between the Akkadian and Aramaic phrases [regarding the “son of man”] seem at best forced, and at worst non-existent” (LUCAS 1990: 171; cf. also COLLINS 1993b: 285f = ibid. 1993a: 131); the ideal ruler designated as man “is the most dubious of all the analogies” (ibid. 1993b: 85 = ibid. 1993a: 130);
 - (5) The assembly of gods is a common feature that is associated with ancient Near Eastern gods and therefore not a particularly significant parallel (ibid.);
 - (6) A significant difference is however the location of the scene in the netherworld (ibid.);
 - (7) The name and the white hair of the “Ancient of days” cannot be derived from Nergal (DAY 1985: 159).

³⁰² In regard to apocryphal parallels the most cited book is *1 Enoch*. There is disagreement (cf. GOLDINGAY 1988: 150 for a short bibliography on the differing positions) if there is any direct influence on Dan 7, because it “cannot be decisively proved” (COLLINS 1993b: 300). Therefore, “we must be content to say that these texts are closely related” (ibid.). The most cited passages from *1 Enoch* are 1:9; 10:6; 14:18–22; 18:11; 21:7–10; 40:1; 46:1; 47:3; 71:8; 71:10–14; 90:20; 90:24–27 (cf. also n. 86 on p. 26).

³⁰³ A significant exception is the alleged Israelite enthronement festival.

part of Dan 7. A tabulation of the most cited Old Testament parallels for the second part of the vision will round off this section.

3.11.1. *Traditio*–historical explanations of the “son of man”³⁰⁴

3.11.1.1. *Messiah*

The Messianic interpretation of the “son of man” which is already attested in Hellenistic Judaism (1 En 46:1; 48:3, 10; 52:4; 4 Ezr 13:26) and rabbinism (cf. STRACK/BILLERBECK 1922: 486) goes beyond the simple identification of the “son of man” with the Messiah. Although there is not always a *traditio*–historical argumentation discernible it is implied that this interpretation is rooted in long–cherished Messianic expectations.

To start with, SELLIN’s emphatic support of a Messianic derivation for the “son of man” is of particular interest since it coincides with the introduction of the mythological background of the “son of man” at the beginning of this century. SELLIN engaged with this new *traditio*–historical interpretation and denied its validity.³⁰⁵ The “son of man” imagery is, according to SELLIN, not based on a foreign ideology newly introduced into Palestine but is “vielmehr ... einfach die uralte jüdische Heilandserwartung in den Tagen des Makkabäeraufstandes neu geboren, zunächst indes aller diesseitigen Züge entkleidet³⁰⁶ und in das Gebiet der transzendentalen Welt verlegt” (1909: 75; cf. also 1933: 129).³⁰⁷

³⁰⁴ The following proposals for Old Testament influence on the “son of man” only include those that provided a *traditio*–historical explanation. Simple identifications which abound are not mentioned in the following review. A good but rare example that distinguished between tradition history and interpretation is BEASLEY–MURRAY’s article on this issue (1983: 55f). The following review depends to a considerable extent on KEARNS 1982: 7–13. It is the only review that makes a distinction between origin and interpretation of the “son of man”. For other valuable bibliographies and summaries on the origin and interpretation of the “son of man” see e.g. SCHMIDT 1969: 227–233; KVANVIG 1988: 347f; CARAGOUNIS 1986: 41–43; KOCH 1980: 228–230; CASEY 1978: 30–39.

³⁰⁵ After raising the question from where the imagery of the “son of man” is derived, SELLIN stated: “Aus einem babylonischen, etwa dem Urmenschen feiernden Mythos, der vor nicht langer Zeit den Juden bekannt geworden, wie denn ja babylonisch–persische Elemente tatsächlich damals im Judentum neuerlich Eingang gefunden haben? So vermutet man jetzt wohl. Aber liegt nicht viel näher, in dieser Epoche neuerwachender Exklusivität hier ein Zurückgreifen auf uraltes jüdisches eschatologisches Gut anzunehmen ...?” (1909: 72).

³⁰⁶ Cf. already Lengerke 1835: 337: “So wird dem Messias also unleugbar eine *höhere, übermenschliche Natur beigelegt* [my emphasis], was auch daraus erhellet, dass er auf den Wolken des Himmels einherfährt, was sonst nur von Gott ausgesagt wird ...”.

³⁰⁷ Similar views which explain the Danielic “son of man” as the latest stage of a long development of Messianic thought have also been put forward by e.g. WELCH 1922: 128–130; YOUNG 1953: 155; *ibid.* 1954: 46f; OESTERLEY 1941: 152.

While SELLIN rejected any mythological influence, BENTZEN embraced this very perspective in his Messianic³⁰⁸ explanation of the origin of the “son of man”. Pre-supposing MOWINCKEL’S (1922: 44–145; 230–244; 268–276) postulated Israelite enthronement festival, BENTZEN centred his Messianic explanation on the king’s role at the Israelite new year festival as he saw it reflected in Psa 2. The king in the role of the *Urmensch*³⁰⁹ and adopted son of God (BENTZEN 1948: 12–14), re-enacted as God’s representative in a historical re-interpretation (ibid. 7) the primordial battle against the chaos in which he finally overcame the enemy under severe suffering (ibid. 19) to bring about creation, i.e., salvation (ibid. 34). With his victory the king thus became the bearer of Yahweh’s *Heil* which was given at creation and was secured by the yearly cultic-dramatic re-enactment. Although the king was actually the guarantor of the present *Heil*, an eschatological aspect developed due to the historical crises the Jewish people underwent, thereby pushing the fulfilment of true salvation into the future (ibid. 36). However, since the Psalms experience what eschatology hopes for, BENTZEN did not find a real distinction between the cultic saviour and the eschatological saviour, i.e., the Messiah, because “beide sind Heilsbringer. Der Grund dazu, dass man ‘Messias’ nur von dem ‘eschatologischen’ Heiland sagen will, kann deshalb nur sein, dass man die Begriffe klar halten will” (ibid. 35). Using this understanding as a basis, BENTZEN explained Dan 7 as an eschatological version of Psa 2 (ibid. 72–74), so that he concluded: “Der Messiaskönig von Psalm 2 ist ‘Vor-Bild’, Typus, des eschatologischen Messias, des Menschensohns im Spätjudentum” (ibid. 75).

A different approach was put forward by A. FEUILLET. Wisdom literature³¹⁰ played according to FEUILLET an important role in the postexilic misery of Palestine. In order to bring to realisation the traditional Messianic aspirations, divine Wisdom – being hypostatised and attributed with eternal existence – took over the characteristics of the Messiah (ibid. 323), while at the same time retaining the universal and supernatural character (ibid. 326). This Messianic understanding of Wisdom, together with the manifestation of the divine presence as encountered in Eze 1 (cf. p. 93), was transformed by the author of Dan 7 into the figure of the “son of man” (ibid. 327).

³⁰⁸ A Messianic connection is already hinted at in BENTZEN 1937: 34: “In Da 7 ist ‘Menschensohn’ jedenfalls keine Bezeichnung des Messias, sondern Symbol für das auserwählte Volk. Da aber nach antiker Auffassung zwischen Individuum und Kollektivum kein scharfer Unterschied besteht ... und im besonderen König und Volk zusammengehören ... so kann und wird im ‘Menschensohn’ von c. 7 der Messias mitgedacht sein ...”.

³⁰⁹ Gen 1:26–28 was understood by BENTZEN as a blessing on the occasion of the enthronement of the first royal couple of the world (1948: 12); on the relationship between the *Urmensch* and the Messiah see ibid. 37–42. BENTZEN’S reference to the *Urmensch* combined with royal ideology was also supported by BORSCH 1967: 89–96.

³¹⁰ FEUILLET referred to Pro 1–9 (1953: 322–325), Ecclesiasticus (ibid. 327–332), Wisdom of Solomon (ibid. 332–337), and Bar 3:9–4:4 (ibid. 337–339). Cf. already SELLIN (1909: 74) who referred to the pre-existence of wisdom and to Pro 9 in relationship to the “son of man” in Dan 7.

Supporting a dependence of the concept of “son of man” on a traditional Messianic perspective, **E. DHANIS** (1964: 48–57) acknowledged several differences³¹¹ between the traditional Messiah and the “son of man”, but argued that these variations were in fact foreshadowed in Israelite tradition, therefore pointing to an inner-Jewish development of the “son of man” as Messiah.

According to **W. WIFALL** the roots of the “son of man” should be traced to royal pre-exilic traditions of the Davidic monarchy in Jerusalem (1974: 103). The so-called “David Story” of Samuel–Kings was used according to WIFALL by the Yahwist in combination with royal mythology to create the primeval history of Genesis. Thus David was on the one hand the “Man” in the heavenly, royal sense of “son of God” as in ancient Near Eastern royal myths. On the other hand, the “David Story” portrayed David as truly human and not divine.³¹² However, with the fall of the monarchy, royal hopes and concepts disintegrated. It was only in the Maccabean period that a revival of old prophetic and royal hopes occurred, this time with an eschatological outlook, so that finally a true form of “Messianism” emerged (ibid. 105f). In this sense the “son of man” in Dan 7 is “an early example of the ‘reintegration’ of the royal mythology which had ‘disintegrated’ with the fall of the Davidic dynasty (*sic*) in 587 B.C.” (ibid. 106).

A renewed attempt to harmonise the traditional Messianic expectations with Dan 7 was made by **H. GESE**. According to GESE (1983: 379–382) Dan 7 is based on the traditional Davidic–Messianic concept (Psa 84:8, 9; 80:17; 110:1; 2) but exhibits also a significant transformation and correction of the Davidic–Messianic tradition by freeing it from its nationalistic–historical limitations to embrace “ein transzendent verstandenes Gottesvikariat der Offenbarungsvermittlung” (ibid. 380f). The traditional Davidic representative as *vicarius Dei* was therefore replaced by a new *representative of the people of Israel*. **C.C. CARAGOUNIS** (1986: 78–81) upheld a similar position when he pointed out that in Dan 7 a new Messianic concept was introduced, i.e., a “transformation of the messianic expectation from the strictly earthly and national Davidic messiah into a supernatural, universalistic and transcendental Messiah” (1986: 79, n. 167).

3.11.1.2. *Angelic being*

While there are a considerable number of angelic identifications of the “son of man” – starting with **SCHMIDT**’S (1900: 26f) inner–Danielic identification of the “son of man” with the guardian angel Michael – not all of them are concerned with a traditio–historical derivation and are therefore not mentioned in the following review.

The first scholar whose argumentation harked back to older Jewish concepts is **GRILL** (1902: 53–56) who held that the Danielic remark that the “son of man” is said to come with the clouds of heaven is a clear indicator that an angelic being was

³¹¹ (1) The divinity of the “son of man”; (2) the pre-existence of the “son of man”; (3) the universality of the eschatological world of Dan 7; (4) the eschatological judgement conducted by the “son of man” (KEARNS 1982: 7f, n. 14).

³¹² In addition, the “fall of mankind” in Genesis can according to WIFALL be traced back to the royal mythological “fall of kingship” from heaven to mankind as well as to the moral fall of David’s personal history (1974: 103f).

in view. Since the “son of man” is not named, GRILL recognised a reflection of the likewise anonymous and anthropomorphic Jahwistic and Elohistic מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה , i.e., the angel of the Lord tradition, which underwent hypostatisation.

F. STIER (1934: 123) argued that the “son of man” can be traced back to the Jewish concept³¹³ of the pre-existent heavenly vizier, being both god-sent saviour and judge, who received eternal dominion after the triumph over his enemies.³¹⁴ This original concept of the heavenly vizier was altered during its history.³¹⁵ The two most important passages which allow one to trace its development are Dan 7:13 (ibid. 96–105) and 1 En 46–48³¹⁶ (ibid. 105–123).

H. KRUSE (1959: 193–198) held that the “son of man” is the leader (*śar śārîm*) of the angelic beings who stands in opposition to the evil celestial spirits who control the destiny of the heathen nations and are symbolised by the beasts of Dan 7. Although the “son of man” indicates the arrival of the Messianic kingdom, he is not called Messiah, a term which is reserved for the Davidic ideal. With regard to the origin of this symbol, KRUSE (ibid. 209) did not find an Old Testament antecedent, although he cautiously acknowledged a certain relationship to the angel of Yahweh whose influence is also discernible on the Danielic מִיכָאֵל – Michael, “one of the chief princes” (Dan 10:13) (ibid. 210).³¹⁷

An angelic³¹⁸ interpretation of the “son of man” with a late inner-Jewish tradition history was proposed by **J. COPPENS**. As an indicator for an angelic interpretation of the Messiah he cited the LXX translation of the Isaianic (9:5) phrase פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ “wonderful counsellor” as $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\varsigma \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ “messenger/angel of great counsel” (1961: 16).³¹⁹

U.B. MÜLLER (1972: 26–29) pointed out that the description of the “son of man” as one being like a man is used in similar fashion elsewhere in the Book of Daniel (i.e., Dan 10:18; 8:15; 9:21; 10:5; cf. ibid. 32) to designate angelic beings. A further indicator for an angelic background for the “son of man” was seen in his presentation before the “Ancient of days”, which recalls the coming of the sons of God into God’s presence.³²⁰ One problem remained: the comprehensive transfer of power upon the “son of man”, which generally is not reported with angelic beings in

³¹³ Cf. Mal 3:1; 1 En 85–90; Testament of Moses 10:2.

³¹⁴ “Auch im (ke) bar ’enaš sehen wir eine in apokalyptischen Kreisen aufgekommene und dort beliebt gewordene Bezeichnung des himmlischen Wesirs, dessen Gestalt im Wesen und Wirken des MS [“son of man”] mehr oder weniger deutlich hindurchscheint” (STIER 1934: 129).

³¹⁵ According to STIER (ibid.) Michael, the “son of man”, Metatron, and En 71 are all different developments of the genuine Israelite–Jewish figure of the heavenly vizier.

³¹⁶ Secondary passages are 1 En 62; 69:26–29; 70 and 71 (ibid. 107, 114).

³¹⁷ For a summary in French of KRUSE’s position see COPPENS 1961: 22, n. 47 (cf. also KEARNS 1982: 11).

³¹⁸ A Messianic background of this same passage for the formation of the “son of man” was rejected by FEUILLET (1953: 174) and DELCOR (1968: 308).

³¹⁹ Cf. also COPPENS 1955: 38; ibid. 1963: 109–111; ibid. 1964: 77, n. 22; ibid. 1968: 501f; ibid. 1969: 124, citing Deu 32:8 as indicator for the angelic intervention in the rule of God’s people.

³²⁰ Referred to were Job 1:6ff; 2:1; 1 Ki 22:19.

the Old Testament. For this reason MÜLLER argued that behind the "son of man" there is a special kind of angelic concept – that of the guardian angel ("Völkerarchonten"), i.e., the special angelic representative of a nation, in this case of Israel, a concept that is according to MÜLLER already present in Deu 32:8, 9 and in Dan 10:20, 21.³²¹ Since the "son of man" is functioning as representative of Israel, the transfer of power becomes clear, because with the rule of the "son of man" there is "immer schon die Herrschaft Israels über alle Völker mitgedacht" (ibid. 28).

Finally, based on the equation of the "saints of the Most High" with angels, and in conjunction with a Canaanite background of the enthronement scene along the lines of EMERTON, B. LINDARS (1975: 55) argued that "the vision foretells the coming climax of the celestial struggle between good and evil" and that "the Son of Man figure could be regarded as the leader of the angels ..." similar to the passages of Zec 14:3–5 and 1 En 1:9.

3.11.1.3. *The people of Israel*

The common denominator for this traditio-historical explanation of the "son of man" is the reference to Psa 8 and/or Psa 80. According to E. HERTLEIN (1911: 62f, 174–176) the author of Dan 7 was indebted to the Old Testament in the selection of the imagery of the beasts as well as the "son of man". HERTLEIN referred to Psa 80:17 in which Israel is compared with a man of the right hand of God, a son of man, and to Psa 8:7–10 in which man is presented as representative of God on earth. A similar position was taken by MONTGOMERY (1927: 319) C.H. DODD (1952: 117),³²² J. BOWMAN (1947–48: 283f),³²³ J.A. BEWER (1955: 25),³²⁴ HEATON (1956: 184),³²⁵ PORTEOUS (1962: 91),³²⁶ D.S. RUSSELL (1964: 340f), M.D. HOOKER (1967: 19), T.F. GLASSON (1976: 83),³²⁷ HARTMAN/DI LELLA (1978: 98–100),³²⁸ FERCH (1979: 88), PORTER (1983: 114),³²⁹ and MOSCA (1986: 501, n. 31).³³⁰

³²¹ On the "Völkerarchonten" cf. MEYER 1938: 39–41; K.G. KUHN 1959: 514f, 698–700.

³²² The main emphasis was on Psa 80 as "a clear analogy" to the Danielic "son of man". Cf. also LONGENECKER (1969: 153) who referred in connection with the "son of man" as a self-designation of Jesus to Dan 7, Psa 8 and 80.

³²³ BOWMAN did not argue for a direct link between Psa 8/80 and Dan 7, only one via Eze 1.

³²⁴ Only a reference to Psa 80:17 without any further comment was made.

³²⁵ HEATON followed DODD but put the main emphasis on Psa 8 which he linked to the creation account. Common to both Dan 7 and Psa 8 is according to HEATON their Babylonian mythological background.

³²⁶ Only a reference to DODD without further discussion.

³²⁷ GLASSON already mentioned this view in his book *The Second Advent: the Origin of the NT Doctrine* (1945) at the end of chapter 3.

³²⁸ Added was Job 25:4–6 and 15:14–16 to further support the idea that the "son of man" derived from the faithful people of Israel.

³²⁹ The main reference was only Psa 80.

³³⁰ In a footnote MOSCA (1986: 501, n. 31) referred to Psa 8:4 as origin for the term "son of man" which he explained in more detail at the end of his essay. Two parallels between the son of man in Dan 7 and Psa 8 were made by MOSCA: In Psa 8 the "son of man" receives dominion over the wild beasts (v. 7), in Dan 7 he receives dominion "that extends of the three surviving 'great beasts'"; secondly, "the positioning of the 'one like a son of man'".

Unique is the view advanced by **M. BLACK**. First, BLACK argued that the “son of man” mentioned in Psa 80:17 was a poetic synonym for Israel or for the king as her representative (1975: 92–94). Second, BLACK treated Dan 7 form-critically as being in line with Isa 6 and Eze 1, both being a theophanic³³¹ throne-vision (ibid. 96f = ibid. 1976: 60f). Third, he followed FEUILLET in his interpretation of the Danielic “son of man”, namely, that the “son of man” is a kind of visible manifestation of the invisible God and thus belongs to the category of the divine glory (ibid. 1975: 97f = ibid. 1976: 61f). BLACK concluded that the two-fold meaning of the “son of man”, i.e., as symbol for Israel as well as of God’s glory, indicates that the Danielic “son of man” was the deification or apotheosis of Israel or, in other words, the merging of these two “son of man” concepts into a single one (ibid. 1975: 99 = ibid. 1976: 62).

3.11.1.4. *The glory of Yahweh*

After a discussion of the vision of Eze 1, **O. PROCKSCH** made a brief reference to the “son of man” in Dan 7 based on his foregoing explanations. There he had argued that Ezekiel did not see the *Urgestalt* of the glory of God, but only the εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ mirrored by the עֵי³³² mentioned in Eze 1:4 (1920: 142). Since the mirrored glory of Yahweh is described as דְּמוּת כְּמִרְאָה אָדָם (“a likeness as the appearance of a man”), PROCKSCH proposed that the Danielic “son of man” derived from this very passage in Eze 1. However, because the “son of man” in Daniel is distinct from the “Ancient of days” he has to be regarded as the hypostatised εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ or glory of Yahweh which is freed from its mirror frame (ibid. 148f). PROCKSCH had as followers a considerable number of scholars such as **W. EICHRODT** (1935: 11, n. 5; ibid. 1961: 15, n. 80), **CH. ROWLAND** (1982: 97, n. 47), **DAY** (1985: 158), and **CARAGOUNIS** (1986: 76–78).

In contrast to the previous group, **FEUILLET** – although basically following PROCKSCH by underlining with additional comparative arguments that Dan 7 is dependent on Eze 1 (1953: 182–185) and that the Danielic “son of man” is a manifestation of the divine glory (ibid. 187–189)³³³ – also felt that this explanation cannot account for a specific Danielic aspect, namely, the Messianic–eschatological outlook. According to FEUILLET it was the postexilic wisdom literature that provided this specific element of the Danielic “son of man” (cf. above p. 89).

J. MUILENBURG followed up FEUILLET’S argument but added that the failure “to take sufficient account of the book of Job, detracts from the force of the argument” (MUILENBURG 1960: 208). He further stated that “apocalyptic wisdom includes

among ‘the clouds of heaven’ echoes the status of the ‘son of man’ in Ps 8,5: ‘little less than divine’” (1986: 517). Cf. also below p. 97.

³³¹ Cf. also BEASLEY–MURRAY 1983: 48f.

³³² Understood as “mirror” by PROCKSCH (1920: 142 with n. 1).

³³³ “... ici l’auteur [i.e., of Dan 7] se rappelle la vision où, sous forme humaine, la gloire divine s’était manifestée dans une nuée au fils de Buzi, on est amené à formuler les conclusions suivantes. Le personnage mystérieux du Fils de l’homme de Daniel est une sorte de manifestation visible de Dieu invisible” (ibid. 187) and “Le Fils de l’homme de Daniel appartient nettement à la catégorie du divin et est comme une sorte d’incarnation de la gloire divine, au même titre que la silhouette humaine contemplée par Ézéchiél (1,26)” (FEUILLET 1953: 188f).

speculation concerning the primordial and cosmological, the mythological and astronomical, and the wonders of the eschatological finale” (ibid. 209) and concluded his article by asking if the “son of man” should not be regarded as “an apocalyptized and mythologized wisdom?” (ibid.).

A unique identification of the glory of Yahweh was put forward by **H.R. BALZ** (1967: 82) who pointed out that Ezekiel saw in Eze 8–11 the same vision as in chapter 1 with the significant difference that a fire-like gleaming being³³⁴ is joined to the glory of Yahweh, whom BALZ identified as Yahweh’s Mandatar, i.e., his priestly representative. In regard to the vision of Dan 7, BALZ argued that its author used Ezekiel’s visionary glory of Yahweh and its priestly representative and created out of them two heavenly beings of glory, namely, the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man” (ibid. 94).

3.11.1.5. Adam

The roots of the “son of man” are according to **P. VOLZ** (1934: 189f) the Jewish³³⁵ concept of the *Urmensch* or *Uradam* whom God created to fight against the demonic monsters in order to redeem the cosmos from these chaotic forces and to free the heavenly beings from the annoyance they exerted. Because the glory of this ideal man was lost, there arose the necessity for an eschatological Adam to restore the lost to the original state. This eschatological saviour was according to VOLZ the Danielic “son of man”.³³⁶

In a brief remark **STEINMANN** (1950: 113 = ibid. 1960: 91) referred to the “son of man” as being the image of God as was Adam, without elucidating further.

A.M. FARRER argued that the seer of Dan 7 read into Gen 1:26 “that the creation and enthronement of Adam is by implication the subjection of the beasts, the removal of their dominion” (1951: 260) and built around such an understanding the “son of man” scene of Dan 7. Therefore, “as Adam makes his appearance after the decree and in consequence of it, so does the Son of Man in Daniel.” The relationship between the singular “son of man” and his pluralised kingship by the saints of the

³³⁴ Eze 8:2; cf. also 9:1–11; 10:2, 6, 7; 40:1ff; 43:1ff, 6; 44:1, 4; 46:19; 47:1, 8ff.

³³⁵ It is true as **KEARNS** (1982: 12, n. 12) pointed out that VOLZ in the first edition of his book (VOLZ 1903: 215) did not trace the *Urmensch* concept back to Jewish traditions and that in the second edition the *Urmensch* concept is not treated as an exclusive Jewish heritage. Nevertheless it seems to be obvious that VOLZ believed in his second edition that the Jewish tradition of the *Urmensch* is exclusively responsible for the “son of man” imagery by giving extra-biblical *Urmensch* concepts only a slight possibility of influence on the Jewish concept and only a marginal role in his discussion. Thus, it seems that VOLZ regarded the Jewish *Urmensch* tradition not necessarily as the original concept, but so strongly independent that he could label it as a “jüdische Idee” (1934: 190).

³³⁶ “Daniel erinnert sich an jenen Menschen, von dem die Sage erzählt, und er sieht ihn im Gesicht; der Retter der Urzeit wird zum Retter der Endzeit ... Der Verfasser der Bilderreden ... kombiniert den eschatologischen Retter und den Urmenschen, die ewige Präexistenz und den endgültigen Zweck desselben. So ist es erklärlich, dass die Vorstellung von der Präexistenz des eschatologischen Helden fast ganz an dem Titel Menschensohn hängt. Als transzendentes Wesen verbindet der “Mensch” die beiden notwendigen Momente seines Berufes: er muss Mensch sein, damit er den Menschen helfe, er muss transzendent sein, damit er Heiland werden kann” (VOLZ 1934: 190).

Most High (Dan 7:18) FARRER compared with the statement: "Let us make *man* in our image ... and let *them* have dominion."

According to STIER (1962: 23f) two different concepts of Adam existed. A pessimistic view of Adam was held by the Yahwist by depicting man as sinful, while an optimistic outlook is found in P (= Gen 1:27) and Psa 8 which associate "man" with original glory, the presence and image of God. A similar positive perception of man is found in Daniel, Enoch and 4 Ezra.³³⁷ From this positive perception of the ideal man priestly circles developed in association with existing Messianic expectations the "son of man" concept as it is also reflected in Dan 7. STIER was followed by F. DEXINGER (1969: 59–67).

3.11.2. Structural traditio–historical explanations of Dan 7:9–14

3.11.2.1. *The Israelite enthronement festival*

In the first edition of his Daniel commentary BENTZEN brought not only the "son of man" as such in relationship to the alleged Israelite enthronement festival (cf. p. 89) but also the judgement of the world empires (1937: 61 = *ibid.* 1952: 33). This was done without any biblical references, however. A decade later, BENTZEN devoted more space to this issue when he argued that the pattern of Psa 2,³³⁸ which he interpreted as reflection of the alleged Israelite enthronement festival, was the blueprint³³⁹ for the whole vision of Dan 7 (1948: 72f = *ibid.* 1955: 74f = *ibid.* 1970: 74f), although the emphasis lies on the second part.

HEATON likewise traced the enthronement of the "son of man" back to the alleged Israelite enthronement festival and the Psalms that are associated with this festival. He stated that:

whether or not such an annual festival was ever held in Israel, there is abundant evidence in the Psalms to demonstrate the central importance of the reigning monarch in Hebrew thought and the close association between this

³³⁷ A similar outlook has been proposed by CULLMANN in Philo's writings and the Pseudo-Clementine writings (cf. also DEXINGER 1969: 63f).

³³⁸ "Das Schema des Psalmes sieht so aus: Zuerst wird der Aufruhr der als 'Könige der Erde' historifizierten Chaosmächte geschildert. Dann folgt die überlegene Aktion des ruhigen, erhabenen Gottes, und im Anschluss daran das Orakel des Königs mit Proklamation seiner Herrschaftsrechte und –ansprüche, und sein Ultimatum an die Vermessenen" (BENTZEN 1948: 16).

³³⁹ "Wie im Psalm folgt auf die Schilderung des polternden Auftretens der als Fabeltiere geschilderten Menschenreiche ein Bild der erhabenen Ruhe: 'Der Hochbetagte' hält Gericht über die Tiere. Als Höhepunkt des Gerichts erscheint 'der Menschensohn', die Verkörperung des Reiches Gottes, des heiligen Volkes: Der König wird eingesetzt, der die Herrschaft Gottes garantiert und dadurch das Heil bringt. Dass 'der Menschensohn' hier als mit dem Reiche Gottes identisch beschrieben wird, kann uns nicht wundern, wenn wir uns erinnern, dass auch der Messias König des alten Kultes mit seinem Volk identisch war. Ihm wird, wie im Psalm, die Weltherrschaft gegeben, damit er in Ewigkeit Herrscher sei. Die 'Tiere' werden vernichtet. Das im Psalm als Warnung angedeutete Urteil wird vollstreckt" (*ibid.* 73).

conviction and the thought of God as Creator and King (cf. Pss. 2, 20, 21, 72, 89, 101, 110, 132) (1956: 183).

EMERTON followed BENTZEN in associating “the beasts rising from the sea, the salvation of Israel, and the act of receiving kingship” with “the complex of ideas of the enthronement festival” (1958: 230f) since “it offers the best explanation of the scene as an organically related whole” (ibid. 233) and therefore interpreted Dan 7 as “an eschatological form of the situation at that festival” (ibid. 231). EMERTON even went further into the details of the tradition–history of the Israelite enthronement festival and postulated that it was “an adaptation of a pre–Davidic Jebusite rite” (1958: 240) in which the chief Jebusite deity El Elyon corresponded to the Canaanite El and Yahweh to Baal.

Further supporters of the Israelite enthronement festival as background of Dan 7 include PORTEOUS (1962: 79f), HAMMER (1976: 75), LACOCQUE (1976: 110f = ibid. 1979: 145f), and DAY (1985: 185).³⁴⁰

3.11.2.2. *Psalms 89*

According to MOSCA Psa 89 shares a common pattern with the Ugaritic Baal myth and Dan 7, thereby serving as a link between the two. He observed the following movement in Psa 89 that corresponds to the Ugaritic Baal myth: (1) revolt and defeat of Yam (vs. 9, 10); (2) the storm god moves to Zaphon (v. 12); (3) Baal’s enthronement (v. 14); and (4) the proclamation of his kingship (v. 18) (1986: 509f). MOSCA furthermore indicated a number of motifs that are shared³⁴¹ by Psa 89 and Dan 7.³⁴² In a next step he argued that the link between the Danielic “son of man” and the Canaanite god Baal is found in Psa 89 in David, who is “invited to play” Baal in v. 25, a passage with mythological overtones of “sea” and “river”: “I will set his hand on the sea and his right hand on the rivers.” To support this role of David in Psa 89 MOSCA (ibid. 512f) put forward additional parallels³⁴³ between Baal and

³⁴⁰ Not entirely clear is the position of COLPE (1969: 418) who seemed not to outrightly reject the idea that an Israelite enthronement festival is part of the background of Dan 7. On the other hand he did also not make a clear affirmative statement in favour of it.

³⁴¹ A clear difference is however observed in the ideological bases: “For Yhwh in the hymn is no storm god who must integrate himself into a complex universe. His authority is absolute, and he rules the heavens (vv. 6–9), the sea (vv. 10–11), and the earth (vv. 12–13) without rival. He has absorbed into himself the victory (vv. 10–11) and might (v. 14) of Canaanite Baal, as well as the creative power (vv. 12–13) and authoritative role in the divine council (vv. 6–8) usually associated with Canaanite El. In Psalm 89 there is only one divine King” (MOSCA 1986: 511).

³⁴² (1) The raging sea/the stirred sea (Psa 89:9/Dan 7:2); (2) out of the sea come Rahab and other enemies/four beasts (Psa 89:10/Dan 7:3); (3) Israel’s horn is exalted/the fourth beast’s horn exalts itself (Psa 89:17/Dan 7:8); (4) the throne (Psa 89:14a/Dan 7:9, 10); (5) the divine council (Psa 89:5–7, 14b/Dan 7:10); (6) Rahab is cursed like a corpse/the fourth beast is killed and its corpse burnt (Psa 89:10/Dan 7:11); (7) other enemies are scattered/the other beasts remain dominionless (Psa 89:10/Dan 7:12) (ibid. 510).

³⁴³ Discontinuity is visible in the underlying ideology: David is not divine (vv. 19–27); David is not king, מלך, but only “my servant” (vv. 3, 20); David does not win dominion but is only awarded with it, while Yahweh is credited for the victory (v. 26b) (ibid. 513f).

David in Psa 89.³⁴⁴ Comparing Dan 7 with Psa 89 Mosca noted the following similarities: (1) references to David and the “son of man” are both given in the context of a vision (Psa 89:19/Dan 7:13); (2) as David is essentially passive and receives dominion from Yahweh,³⁴⁵ so is the Danielic “son of man” (Dan 7:14); (3) both passages mention the cloud, namely, the “enduring witness in the clouds” and the “clouds of heavens” (Psa 89:37/Dan 7:13).

In a final section MOSCA argued that Psa 8:2 reflects the *Chaoskampf* which links it with Psa 89 and provides with the “son of man” in v. 4, which is also conceived in royal terms, the source of the Danielic expression “son of man”. As an additional parallel to Dan 7 MOSCA referred to Psa 8:3: “When I look at your heavens”, i.e., the same that Daniel was doing in his vision.³⁴⁶

3.11.2.3. Zion–David/four–empire/enemy–of–God traditions

HAAG’S semantic analysis of his traditio–historical study on the second part of the vision of Dan 7 moved along the commonly–cited Old Testament passages for this section (1993a: 164–167) which do not necessitate repetition. More important is the theological synthesis presented by HAAG, which distinguished three biblical traditions that were employed by the author of Dan 7.

The basis of the vision in Dan 7 involved the combination of two traditions: (1) God is an absolute sovereign ruler over creation despite the threats of the powers of chaos; (2) God installs a representative to rule eternally over his redeemed creation. The Old Testament antecedent of this view is the Zion–David–tradition which is especially notable in Psa 89. The Zion–tradition in Psa 89 is reflected in Yahweh who thrones (vv. 5, 7) as creator of heaven and earth (v. 11) and victor over the powers of chaos (vv. 9, 10) unchallenged in the council of the holy ones. The David–tradition involves the instalment of a human representative whose throne lasts forever (vv. 19, 25, 27, 36, 37). An eschatological adaptation of the Zion–David–tradition occurred in exilic–postexilic times that finally led to its use in Dan 7 (ibid. 176–179).

The basic Zion–David–tradition was supplemented by the four–empire–tradition which acknowledges that God transfers limited dominion to foreign nations to execute his judgements against Israel and Judah on the way to the realisation of his eternal dominion.³⁴⁷ Additional impetus to use this tradition in Dan 7 was the fact that the divinely–appointed enemies were also described as the rebellious sea,³⁴⁸ which is closely linked to the Zion–tradition³⁴⁹ (ibid. 179f).

³⁴⁴ (1) David is adopted by God, who becomes “my father” (v. 26) and David “the first–born son” (v. 27) / Baal refers to El as “my father” and is called “El’s son” (CTA 3.E.2; 43,47–48); (2) David’s title “most high” (v. 27) corresponds to Baal’s epithet “most high” (1y; CTA 16.3.6,8); (3) David’s dominion is eternal (vv. 28, 29, 36, 37) as is Baal’s (CTA 2.4.10); (4) “I will establish your offspring forever (Psa 89:4) / “El the king who established him” (CTA 3.E.44=4.4.48; cf. a similar parallel for Psa 89:23 “No foe shall rise up”: in CTA 3.D.49–50 “No foe has risen up against Baal”; DAHOOD 1968: 317).

³⁴⁵ Cf. n. 343.

³⁴⁶ Cf. also p. 92 with n. 330.

³⁴⁷ Isa 5:26–29; 10:5, 6; Jer 1:15; 4:6; 6:1, 22; 25:9; 27; Isa 8:7, 8; 28:15.

³⁴⁸ Isa 8:7, 8; 28:15.

³⁴⁹ Psa 46:3, 4; 74:13, 14; 89:10; 93:3, 4.

A final enlargement of the four-empire tradition was made with the inclusion of the enemy-of-God-tradition, which concentrates on the characterisation of the four empires as ultimate powers of chaos in the light of a typical representative, i.e., the fourth beast. This beast reveals its antigodly stance in its rebellion against God’s intended eternal rule. At the same time its removal also heralds the consummation of Yahweh’s eternal kingship (*ibid.* 180–182).³⁵⁰

3.11.2.4. *Ezekiel*

In contrast to HAAG’S traditio-historical explanation of Dan 7, the following proposal has a narrower base by referring only to sections of one specific biblical book, that of the prophet Ezekiel.

BOWMAN (1947–48: 285) drew attention to the fact that certain features of Dan 7 recall Eze 1. He mentioned the fiery wheeled throne coming in the clouds (Eze 1:4) and the four beasts (Eze 1:5).

Considerably more comprehensive were the parallels advanced by **FEUILLET** (1953: 182–185) who argued that Dan 7 is largely dependent on the *book* of Ezekiel.

<i>Parallel</i>	<i>Ezekiel</i>	<i>Daniel</i>
Visions of God / night vision	1:1	7:2, 13
Divinity associated with clouds	1:4	7:13
Animals represent hostile nations	17:3; 19:1–9; 29:3–5; 32:2–6; 38:4	7:1–8
Winged animals	1:6–11	7: 4, 6
Throne engulfed in fire	1:15–28	7:9, 10
מראה (“appearance”)	1:13, 14; 8:2, 4, 15, 28; 10:7; 26:2; 27:2; 40:3; 41:21; 42:11; 43:3	8:15; 10:16
Figure in white linen	9:2, 3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7	10:5; 12:6
Messianic kingdom symbolised as mountain	17:22, 23	2:35
“King of kings”	26:7	2:37
Daniel interprets “mysteries”	28:3	4:9
Ram and he-goat	34:17; 39:18	8
Nebuchadnezzar and the tree	17:3f	4:5–25
Ezechiel and Daniel fall to the ground	1:29; 3:23; 11:13; 43:3; 44:3	8:17ff; 10:9–11
Prophet transported by the Spirit	8:3	8:2
Son of man	throughout the book	8:17
Time of the end	21:30–34; 35:5	11:35–40; 12:4, 8, 17
Palestine the glorious land	20:6, 15	8:9; 11:16, 41
A vision for many days	12:27	8:26
To shine like brightness	8:2	12:3

In a manner similar to that of FEUILLET, **BALZ** (1967: 85f) pointed out the basic similarity of motifs in Eze 1 and Dan 7. He listed the following parallels:

³⁵⁰ Isa 10; 14; Eze 38; 39; Zec 12–14; Jdt 1–3.

<i>Parallel</i>	<i>Ezekiel</i>	<i>Daniel</i>
Storm and clouds	1:4	7:2
Four animals come out of the cloud / sea	1:5	7:3
Four heavenly beings / animals are human-like	1:5, 8, 10	7:4, 8
Throne with wheels	1:26; 1:15–21	7:9
The glory of God takes place on the throne	1:26–28	7:9
Setting: Babylon	1:1	7:1

While **RUSSELL** (1964: 341) considered an influence from Eze 1 on the “son of man” in Dan 7 as a possibility, **H. SAHLIN** (1969: 47f) proposed a much closer relationship between Eze 1 and Dan 7, listing the following parallels: (1) both thrones are associated with fire; (2) four beings in Eze 1 are symbols of the four winds while four beasts are designated in Dan 7 as the four winds of heaven; (3) the four winds stir up the great sea in Dan 7, which is the heavenly ocean or the firmament similar to that in Eze 1:22, 23.

BLACK (1975: 97 = *ibid.* 1976: 60f) and **ROWLAND** (1982: 97, n. 47) followed **BOWMAN** and **FEUILLET**, while **KVANVIG** argued that the parallels between Eze 1 and Hen 14 are closer than between Eze 1 and Dan 7, but nevertheless mentioned a number of structural parallels for Eze 1 and Dan 7 (1984: 115–117):

<i>Structure of content</i>	<i>Dan 7</i>	<i>Eze 1</i>
Action of Nature	Winds of the heavens (v. 2)	Stormy wind (v. 4)
	Clouds of the heavens (v. 13)	Great cloud (v. 4)
<i>Mischwesen</i> ³⁵¹	Four animals (v. 3)	Four living beings (v. 5)
	Four wings (v. 6)	Four wings (v. 6)
	Four heads (v. 6)	Four heads (v. 6)
Throne scene ³⁵²	God on the throne (vv. 9, 10)	God on the throne (v. 26)
	Wheels (v. 9)	Wheels (vv. 15, 16)
	Fire (v. 10)	Fire (v. 27)

Last to be mentioned in this group is **D.J. HALPERIN** who basically echoed **FEUILLET** in mentioning that the author of Dan 7 may have used Eze 1.³⁵³ Differ-

³⁵¹ In addition to the parallels in the table above the description of both sets of *Mischwesen* mention traits of the lion, the eagle and man, but they also differ since in Daniel the description is done in a consecutive order, in Ezekiel as a single unit (KVANVIG 1984: 114).

³⁵² Differences in the throne scenes are: (a) In Ezekiel God is already seated, in Daniel he sits down himself; (b) in Ezekiel only God is mentioned, in Daniel a multitude; (c) in Ezekiel the throne scene introduces a commission, in Daniel the throne scene is part of a judgment scene (*ibid.* 114f).

³⁵³ Specific parallels that are mentioned by HALPERIN are: the fiery throne; (2) the wheels; (3) “the one like a human being”; (4) the winds; (5) the number of four animals; (6) the animals’ appearance is a prelude of that of the divine throne and they are finally in subjection to it; (7) both set of animals are inimical forces, in Ezekiel they are “subjected against their will to the figure on the throne” which also explains that three of Daniel’s

ences³⁵⁴ were explained by HALPERIN as stemming from the interpretation of Ezekiel made by the author of Dan 7.³⁵⁵

beasts are not destroyed, but are "subjected together to the throne and its occupant" (1988: 77).

³⁵⁴ The following differences are mentioned by HALPERIN (ibid.): (1) the value of the animals is different (Ezekiel: they are God's servants and throne bearers; Daniel: they are enemies of God); (2) progress in Ezekiel is spatial in Daniel it is temporal; (3) the descriptions of the animals; (4) the sea is not mentioned in Ezekiel, which is of mythological origin.

³⁵⁵ While specific criticism of Old Testament influence on the first part of the vision is almost non-existent, it is considerable for the second part due to primarily one issue, namely, that of the origin of the "son of man". Since many discussions are elaborate explanations a detailed summary of criticism would amount to another complete study. In this light the following remarks serve only as broad outline. In addition it has to be remarked that all those objections that were mentioned in discussion about the identity and interpretation of the "son of man" are not included. Thus only those that were made against the above traditio-historical explanations are given below.

- (1) *Basic criticism* of inner-biblical derivations of the "son of man" pointed out that:
 - (a) Jewish tradition furnishes no adequate explanation of the origin of the "son of man", of the dual role as symbol and personality, and of its connection with the Messianic hope (KRAELING 1927: 141f);
 - (b) an Old Testament genealogy for the "son of man" cannot be established (COLPE 1969: 409);
 - (c) an extra-biblical origin is suggested because the *divine* attributes of the *man*-like figure in Dan 7 could only have been transferred to the "son of man" when he was considered to have been a heavenly being and not a worldly Messiah (ibid. 409);
 - (d) Dan 7 speaks of two distinct divine beings, whereby the divinity of the "son of man" is established by the association with the Old Testament motif of Yahweh coming "with the clouds of heaven". Since the "son of man" is subordinate to the "Ancient of days" Dan 7 exhibits "the idea that there is another God superior to Yahweh [which] is foreign to the OT" (COLLINS 1977: 100);
 - (e) no inner-Israelite derivation completely satisfies (KOCH 1980: 230);
- (2) *Messiah*: "The decisive objection against the messianic interpretation is that nowhere in the book do we find either support for or interest in the Davidic monarchy" (COLLINS 1993b: 309). The counter-argument against such an objection is provided by the positions of GESE and CARAGOUNIS who postulated a transformed Messianic concept in Dan 7 (cf. above p. 90);
- (3) *Angelic being*: Against a connection with Michael, as proposed by SCHMIDT (1900), it has been objected that the name of this well-known celestial being is not mentioned (KRAELING 1927: 33; CAQUOT 1967: 59) and that his fighting role is not visible in Dan 7 (ibid.); STIER's suggestion has been criticised on the basis that the "son of man" in Dan 7 is presented as completely inactive which speaks against the role STIER assigned to him. The same criticism was directed towards KRUSE (ibid. 59f);
- (4) *The people of Israel*: COLPE (1969: 410) rejected that Psa 80 served as ancestor for the "son of man" because v. 16 which identifies the son with Israel is a doublet to v. 18b and has to be deleted. Against BLACK's proposal of an apotheosis of Israel GOLDINGAY (1988: 171) remarked that "it is a long step, however, from a belief in a renewed, celestial Israel such as the interpretative vision may envisage, to the deification of Israel";
- (5) *The glory of Yahweh*: (a) BAUMGARTNER objected to PROCKSCH's explanation because "die völlige Verselbständigung, die bei dem dort nur gelegentlich und unbetonten Ausdruck (*d' mūt k' mar' ē ādām* Ez 1 26) so viel ferner liegt als bei Gottes

- Geist, Wort oder Weisheit" (1939: 217); in regard to FEUILLET's traditio-historical explanation COPPENS (1955: 34–36) pointed out that there are also significant differences between wisdom literature and Messianic thought, which are: Proverbs is missing an eschatological and collective-nationalistic outlook, while Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom of Solomon, although having a distinct eschatological perspective, practically eliminate the Messianic function by binding Wisdom so close to God that no distinction remains which would serve as prototype for the "son of man". EMERTON evaluated FEUILLET's theory as improbable and not very convincing, since "the analogy of the personified figure of wisdom would lead us to expect the Son of man still to be called the glory of God" (1958: 232, n. 1); according to DELCOR (1968: 310f) the "son of man" does not belong to the divine sphere and is not pre-existent, which rules out a link to Eze 1; COLLINS noted that FEUILLET's "view is compatible with the OG text but scarcely with the MT, where the human figure is clearly distinct and subordinate (1993b: 310, n. 286)"; (b) COLPE (1969: 414) reacted against MUILENBURG by arguing that when Jewish wisdom speculation and the "son of man" concept occur together it is wisdom that reveals the "son of man" or he himself possesses wisdom, which completely rules out that the "son of man" is a doublet of wisdom; (c) BALZ was opposed by MÜLLER (1972: 53) by indicating that: (1) Eze 1 does not explain how God becomes the "Ancient of days" since only a reference of man-likeness can be adduced from Eze 1 but not any of an aged God; (2) the figure of the angel scribe of Eze 8–11 is too far removed from the "son of man"; (3) the hypostatisation as a splintering-off of divine functions is not foreshadowed in the angelic figure of Eze 8–11; (4) the designation of the angelic figure of Eze 8–11 as Mandatar, i.e., as priestly representative, is not accurate, since he is only an angel; (5) the "son of man" as a splintering-off of a divine function is questionable since his relationship with the people and not with God is emphasised; KVANVIG (1984: 115, 119) added the following remarks: (6) there is no similarity between the figures of Dan 7:13 and Eze 1:26 except their man-likeness; (7) the similarity cannot be interpreted as identity or as a splintering-off from a main figure;
- (6) *Adam*: Adam was originally purely protologic and not a salvific (COLPE 1969: 413) or an eschatological figure (CAQUOT 1967: 59); FARRER's link to Gen 1:26 was rejected by HOOKER (1967: 24, n. 1). If there is any analogy it could only be in v. 28 where an expressive command of dominion and authority is given. However, the chronology of events in Gen 1 and Dan 7 is different because in the vision the beasts are subjugated before the "son of man" appears;
- (7) *Israelite enthronement festival*: (a) While BAUMGARTNER (1939: 220) criticised that the alleged enthronement festival does not account for the "Ancient of days", the stream of fire, nor the "son of man", the general objection is that this festival is a reconstruction, purely hypothetical and any survival of a festival or ideology into post-exilic time is pure speculation (MOSCA 1986: 499; CASEY 1979: 36; DELCOR 1968: 309; RHODES 1961: 428; COPPENS 1955: 33; FEUILLET 1953: 179; (b) BENTZEN's suggestion that Psa 2 speaks about the Primordial king and that ~~the~~ in v. 5 refers back to the enthronement of the king in primordial time, instead of to the coming Messiah was rejected by FEUILLET (1953: 179f); likewise critical was CASEY who questioned that Dan 7 depends on Psa 2 by pointing out that Dan 7 has "no proper equivalent to the Anointed One in the psalm" (1979: 36), since the "son of man" is a symbol of the saints and is not enthroned; BENTZEN's combination of the *Urmensch* and royal ideology was objected to by EMERTON pointing out that a "genuine myth of a Primal Man among Semitic peoples is not sufficiently strong for it to be made the basis of royal ideology" (1958: 231). Furthermore, he added that the "son of man" is associated with attributes of Yahweh not of a Davidic king (ibid.

3.11.3. The most cited Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:9–14

Although the major issue of the second part of the vision of Dan 7 is the enigmatic “son of man”, there are also numerous other elements that were compared with Old Testament passages. Thus the discussion on the “son of man” issue should not lead the reader to assume that there are not many other links to the Old Testament. The following tabulation lists about 70 most-cited Old Testament³⁵⁶ passages for the second part of the vision of Dan 7³⁵⁷ that refer to elements other than the “son of man”.

The heavenly council/court (Dan 7:9a, 10b)	
Deu 33:2	KEIL 1872: 230; DRIVER 1900:86; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; CHARLES 1929: 184; YOUNG 1953: 152; HEATON 1956: 178; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 422; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; ZEVIT 1968: 393; LEUPOLD 1969: 304; DELCOR 1971: 151; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 500; TOWNER 1984: 99; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 28; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149, 166
1 Ki 22:19	DRIVER 1900: 86; MONTGOMERY 1927: 296; JUNKER 1932: 53; BENTZEN 1937: 33 = <i>ibid.</i> 1952: 61; YOUNG 1953: 150; HEATON 1956: 178; JEFFERY 1956: 457f; RHODES 1961: 421f; PORTEOUS 1962: 87; PLÖGER 1965: 110; ZEVIT 1968: 393; DELCOR 1971: 151; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 107f = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 142f; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 217; CASEY 1979: 23; KEARNS 1982: 175, n. 408 and 193, n. 504; TOWNER 1984: 97; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 24; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149, 164, 166; COLLINS 1993b: 303; HAAG 1993a: 165; BAUER 1996: 156

231f). EMERTON was followed in his criticism by COLPE (1969: 419, n. 121) and DAY (1985: 158); (c) lastly, EMERTON’s reference to the Jebusites and their role in the adaptation of the enthronement festival was qualified as a theory dependent “upon assumptions ... quite precarious (MUILENBURG 1960: 207), as being “based on analogy and conjecture” (RHODES 1961: 428), as “unprovable (COLPE 1969: 412, n. 152) as “Jebusite conjectures [that] cannot be determinative for the views of a second-century conservative” (CASEY 1979: 37), and as “extremely dubious manner of hypothesizing, whereof no palpable evidence is forthcoming ... It is characteristic that a passage of twelve lines ... contains no less than seven ‘probabilities’ and ‘likelihoods’” (CARAGOUNIS 1986: 39, n. 14);

- (8) *Ezekiel*: “The attempt of David Halperin ... to derive the beasts from the four חיות of Ezekiel’s vision is unconvincing, despite other points of rapprochement with Ezekiel in Daniel 7” (COLLINS 1993b: 295, n. 15); “There is no hint of a bear or leopard in Ezekiel 1” (BRYAN 1995: 221); “the function of the four living creatures is different from that of the four beasts” (*ibid.* 222).

³⁵⁶ For apocryphal parallels see n. 302 on p. 87.

³⁵⁷ Although the presented bibliographic references were established as carefully as possible I do not claim to not have overlooked some parallels. Nevertheless it is hoped that the result represents a helpful overview of Old Testament parallels to Dan 7:9–14. As mentioned in n. 125 on p. 35, sometimes an overlap occurs, because the same biblical parallel was discussed by scholars under different headings, e.g., there is often no clear-cut distinction made between Dan 7:9a and 7:10b when referring to Old Testament parallels. Therefore all references that were cited for a heavenly council/court were placed in one category.

Job 1:6	JUNKER 1932: 53; HEATON 1956: 178; RHODES 1961: 421; PORTEOUS 1962: 87; PLÖGER 1965: 110; ZEVIT 1968: 393; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; CASEY 1979: 23; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 495; MOSCA 1986: 500, n. 24; HAAG 1993a: 165 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Job 2:1	RHODES 1961: 421; PLÖGER 1965: 110; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 495; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 24; HAAG 1993a: 165 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Job 15:8	CHARLES 1929: 184; RHODES 1961: 421; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 491
Psa 9:4	DRIVER 1900: 86; ZEVIT 1968: 393; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142
Psa 29:1	RHODES 1961: 421; KEARNS 1982: 117f, n. 126 and 192, n. 493; HAAG 1993a: 165 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Psa 50	JEFFERY 1956: 457; ZEVIT 1968: 392; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149, 164
Psa 68:17	KEIL 1872: 230; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; YOUNG 1953: 152; JEFFERY 1956: 458; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; ZEVIT 1968: 393; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; TOWNER 1984: 99; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 28; KVANVIG 1988: 510; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166; COLLINS 1993b: 302
Psa 82:1	MONTGOMERY 1927: 296; YOUNG 1953: 150; RHODES 1961: 421; PORTEOUS 1962: 88; PLÖGER 1965: 110; ZEVIT 1968: 393; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 217; CASEY 1979: 23 LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; KEARNS 1982: 114, n. 113 and 192, ns. 490, 496; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 303; HAAG 1993a: 165
Psa 89:6, 7	KEIL 1872: 230; MARTI 1901: 52; JEFFERY 1956: 458; KEARNS 1982: 192, ns. 498f; COLLINS 1993b: 303; HAAG 1993a: 165; BAUER 1996: 156
Psa 93:13	LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 303
Psa 122:5	MONTGOMERY 1927: 296; CHARLES 1929: 181; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 457; RHODES 1961: 421; DELCOR 1971: 150; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 24; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; COLLINS 1993b: 301
Isa 6:1, 2, 8	YOUNG 1953: 150; ZEVIT 1968: 393; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; ibid. 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; GOLDINGAY 1988: 149, 164; COLLINS 1993b: 300; KEARNS 1982: 176, n. 412; ibid. 193, n. 505; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 24; HAAG 1993a: 165; BAUER 1996: 152
Zec 14:5	DRIVER 1900: 86; DELCOR 1971: 151; CASEY 1979: 23; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164
The "Ancient of days" (Dan 7:9)	
Job 36:26	JUNKER 1932: 51; JEFFERY 1956: 457; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; HAAG 1993a: 164 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Psa 55:19	MARTI 1901: 52; MONTGOMERY 1927: 297; HEATON 1956: 179; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142
Psa 90:2	HEATON 1956: 179; JEFFERY 1956: 457; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165
Psa 102:24-27	JUNKER 1932: 51; CASPARI 1925: 185; JEFFERY 1956: 457; PLÖGER 1965: 111; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; HAAG 1993a: 164 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Isa 6:1	JEFFERY 1956: 457; RHODES 1961: 421; HAAG 1993a: 164
Isa 41:4	JUNKER 1932: 52; JEFFERY 1956: 457; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; HAAG 1993b: 58 = ibid. 1993a: 164
Isa 44:6	MARTI 1901: 52; HEATON 1956: 179; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142
Eze 1:26	EWALD 1868: 403; KEIL 1872: 230; DRIVER 1900: 85; CHARLES 1929: 181; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 457; RHODES 1961: 421
The white raiment/like wool (Dan 7:9)	
Psa 51:7	DRIVER 1900: 85; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 422; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 142; BALDWIN 1978: 141; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165
Isa 1:18	MARTI 1901: 52; DRIVER 1900: 85; JUNKER 1932: 52; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 422; ZEVIT 1968: 392; DELCOR 1971: 150; LACOCQUE 1976: 108 = ibid. 1979: 143; TOWNER 1984: 98; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 26; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; HAAG 1993a: 164 = ibid. 1993b: 58

God enthroned and/or manifested in fire (Dan 7:9c, 10a)	
Gen 15:17	DRIVER 1900: 85; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 422
Exo 3:2	KEIL 1872: 230; DRIVER 1900: 85; CASPARI 1925: 188; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; JUNKER 1932: 52; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 458; COPPENS 1961: 9, n. 14; RHODES 1961: 422; ZEVIT 1968: 392; LEUPOLD 1969: 302; HAMMER 1976: 77; BALDWIN 1978: 141; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; COLLINS 1993b: 302; BAUER 1996: 156
Exo 19:18	JUNKER 1932: 52; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; COLLINS 1993b: 302; BAUER 1996: 156
Exo 20:18	JUNKER 1932: 52; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165
Num 16:35	DRIVER 1900: 85; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 422
Deu 4:24	DRIVER 1900: 85; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; BENTZEN 1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 458; COPPENS 1961: 9, n. 14; RHODES 1961: 422; LEUPOLD 1969: 302; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165
Deu 9:3	BENTZEN 1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; JEFFERY 1956: 458; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143
Deu 33:2	CASPARI 1925: 188; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; COPPENS 1961: 9, n. 14; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; COLLINS 1993b: 302; HAAG 1993a: 164 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Psa 18:9–14	YOUNG 1953: 151; DELCOR 1971: 151; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165
Psa 50:3	MARTI 1901: 52; DRIVER 1900: 85; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; JUNKER 1932: 53; BENTZEN 1937: 33 = ibid. 1952: 61; FEUILLET 1953: 183; YOUNG 1953: 151; HEATON 1956: 179; JEFFERY 1956: 458; COPPENS 1961: 9, n. 14; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; PLÖGER 1965: 111; DELCOR 1971: 151; ZEVIT 1968: 392; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 141; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166; COLLINS 1993b: 302; HAAG 1993a: 164f = ibid. 1993b: 58
Psa 97:2–4	MARTI 1901: 52; DRIVER 1900: 85; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; BENTZEN 1952: 61; FEUILLET 1953: 183; HEATON 1956: 179; JEFFERY 1956: 458; COPPENS 1961: 9, n. 14; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; DELCOR 1971: 151; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 141; GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166; COLLINS 1993b: 302
Isa 6:1	CASPARI 1925: 188; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; RHODES 1961: 422; BALZ 1967: 85; ZEVIT 1968: 392; HAMMER 1976: 77
Eze 1:4	DRIVER 1900: 85; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; YOUNG 1953: 151; HEATON 1956: 178; DELCOR 1971: 151; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164f; COLLINS 1993b: 302
Eze 1:13	EWALD 1868: 403; DRIVER 1900: 85; JUNKER 1932: 53; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; YOUNG 1953: 151; HEATON 1956: 178; EMERTON 1958: 253; GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; ARCHER 1985: 89; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; COLLINS 1993b: 302; HAAG 1993a: 165 = ibid. 1993b: 58
Eze 1:26	STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; ZEVIT 1968: 392; HAMMER 1976: 77; BALDWIN 1978: 141; KEARNS 1982: 176, n. 415; GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; BLACK 1985: 151
Eze 1:27	DRIVER 1900: 85; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; YOUNG 1953: 151; BLACK 1985: 151; HALPERIN 1988: 76; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165; COLLINS 1993b: 302
Eze 10:1, 2, 7	DRIVER 1900: 85; JUNKER 1932: 53; STEINMANN 1950: 112 = ibid. 1960: 89; HEATON 1956: 178; EMERTON 1958: 253; ZEVIT 1968: 392; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = ibid. 1979: 143; BLACK 1985: 151; GOLDINGAY 1988: 165

The wheels (Dan 7:9)	
Eze 1:15–28	MARTI 1901: 52; DRIVER 1900: 86; CASPARI 1925: 186; MONTGOMERY 1927: 298; CHARLES 1929: 183; STIER 1934: 101; YOUNG 1953: 151; BEWER 1955: 25; JEFFERY 1956: 458; PORTEOUS 1962: 88; PLÖGER 1965: 111; DELCOR 1971: 151; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; COLLINS 1977: 100; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; CASEY 1979: 23; BEASLEY-MURRAY 1983: 48; GESE 1983: 380, n. 16; TOWNER 1984: 98; DAY 1985: 157; BLACK 1985: 151; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 27; HALPERIN 1988: 76; KVANVIG 1988: 509; COLLINS 1993b: 302
Eze 10:2	CHARLES 1929: 183; JEFFERY 1956: 458; PORTEOUS 1962: 88; BLACK 1985: 151; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 27; COLLINS 1993b: 302
God and/or the council/court in judgement (Dan 7:10)	
Psa 93:13	JEFFERY 1956: 458; GOLDINGAY 1988: 164; COLLINS 1993b: 303
Jer 23:18	MARTI 1901: 52; CHARLES 1929: 184; JEFFERY 1956: 458; RHODES 1961: 421; KEARNS 1982: 192, n. 492; HAAG 1993a: 165
Jer 23:22	CHARLES 1929: 184; RHODES 1961: 421; HAAG 1993a: 165
The books (Dan 7:10)	
Exo 32:32, 33	CHARLES 1929: 184; JUNKER 1932: 47; HEATON 1956: 179; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; ZEVIT 1968: 393; LEUPOLD 1969: 305; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 141; TOWNER 1984: 100; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59; BAUER 1996: 156
Est 6:1	DRIVER 1900: 87; JEFFERY 1956: 459; ROST 1974: 74; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166
Psa 56:8	DRIVER 1900: 87; MONTGOMERY 1927: 299; CHARLES 1929: 184; HEATON 1956: 179; JEFFERY 1956: 457; JEFFERY 1956: 459; RHODES 1961: 422; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 141; TOWNER 1984: 100; COLLINS 1993b: 303; BAUER 1996: 156
Psa 69:28	CHARLES 1929: 184; JUNKER 1932: 47; HEATON 1956: 179; LEUPOLD 1969: 305; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; CASEY 1979: 23; TOWNER 1984: 100; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59
Psa 139:16	JUNKER 1932: 47; LEUPOLD 1969: 305; TOWNER 1984: 100; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59
Isa 4:3	MARTI 1901: 52; CHARLES 1929: 184; CASEY 1979: 23; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59
Isa 65:6	DRIVER 1900: 87; MONTGOMERY 1927: 299; CHARLES 1929: 185; HEATON 1956: 179; YOUNG 1953: 153; JEFFERY 1956: 457, 459; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; PLÖGER 1965: 111; ZEVIT 1968: 393; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 29; COLLINS 1993b: 303; HAAG 1993a: 166 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59; BAUER 1996: 156
Jer 17:1	MONTGOMERY 1927: 299; YOUNG 1953: 152; JEFFERY 1956: 457
Dan 10:21	ZEVIT 1968: 393; TOWNER 1984: 100; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166
Dan 12:1	TOWNER 1984: 100; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59
Mal 3:16	DRIVER 1900: 87; MONTGOMERY 1927: 299; CHARLES 1929: 184; JUNKER 1932: 47; YOUNG 1953: 152; HEATON 1956: 179; JEFFERY 1956: 457; JEFFERY 1956: 459; RHODES 1961: 422; PORTEOUS 1962: 89; ZEVIT 1968: 393; LEUPOLD 1969: 305; DELCOR 1971: 152; HAMMER 1976: 77; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; BALDWIN 1978: 141; HARTMAN/DI LELLA 1978: 218; CASEY 1979: 23; TOWNER 1984: 100; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 29; COLLINS 1993b: 303; HAAG 1993a: 165 = <i>ibid.</i> 1993b: 59; BAUER 1996: 156
Burned with fire/judgement executed (Dan 7:11)	
Psa 74:13, 14	LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; KEARNS 1982: 158f, n. 341 and 161, ns. 346f; PORTER 1983: 115
Psa 89:9–11	LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; KEARNS 1982: 162, n. 350; PORTER 1983: 114

Jos 7:25	BENTZEN 1937: 33 = <i>ibid.</i> 1952: 61; JEFFERY 1956: 459; LACOCQUE 1976: 109 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 143; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 30; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166
Isa 27:1	LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; KEARNS 1982: 161, ns. 346, 348 and 162, n. 350; PORTER 1983: 114
Isa 30:33	MONTGOMERY 1927: 301; JUNKER 1932: 55; JEFFERY 1956: 459; LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; GOLDINGAY 1988: 166
Isa 51:9, 10	LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144; KEARNS 1982: 161, ns. 347, 350 and 163, n. 352 and 164, n. 361; PORTER 1983: 114
Eze 39:6	JUNKER 1932: 55; JEFFERY 1956: 459; LACOCQUE 1976: 110 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 144
The clouds of heaven (Dan 7:13)	
Exo 19:16	STIER 1934: 101; DELCOR 1968: 303 = <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 154; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 32
Deu 33:26	COLLINS 1977: 100; KEARNS 1982: 103, n. 58; 105, n. 67; 106, n. 74; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 32
1 Ki 8:10, 11	FEUILLET 1953: 188; RHODES 1961: 423; DELCOR 1968: 303 = <i>ibid.</i> 1971: 154; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 146
Psa 18:9–12	KEIL 1872: 236; STIER 1934: 101; YOUNG 1953: 154; <i>ibid.</i> 1954: 45; JEFFERY 1956: 460; RHODES 1961: 423; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; KEARNS 1982: 104, n. 62; <i>ibid.</i> 131, n. 189; ARCHER 1985: 90; GOLDINGAY 1988: 167
Psa 97:2–4	KEIL 1872: 236; STIER 1934: 101; FEUILLET 1953: 188; YOUNG 1953: 154; <i>ibid.</i> 1954: 45; RHODES 1961: 423; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 146; ARCHER 1985: 90
Psa 104:3	KEIL 1872: 236; MONTGOMERY 1927: 303; CHARLES 1929: 186; STIER 1934: 101; YOUNG 1953: 154; <i>ibid.</i> 1954: 44; HEATON 1956: 183; JEFFERY 1956: 460; RHODES 1961: 423; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; COLLINS 1977: 100; KEARNS 1982: 104, n. 61; <i>ibid.</i> 130, n. 187; ARCHER 1985: 90; MOSCA 1986: 501, n. 32
Isa 19:1	KEIL 1872: 236; MONTGOMERY 1927: 303; CHARLES 1929: 186; YOUNG 1953: 154; <i>ibid.</i> 1954: 45; HEATON 1956: 183; JEFFERY 1956: 460; RHODES 1961: 423; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; KEARNS 1982: 104, n. 60; ARCHER 1985: 90; GOLDINGAY 1988: 167; BAUER 1996: 159
Eze 1:4	FEUILLET 1953: 188; BALZ 1967: 85; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 146; KVANVIG 1988: 512; BAUER 1996: 159
Nah 1:3	KEIL 1872: 236; STIER 1934: 102; FEUILLET 1953: 188; LEUPOLD 1969: 308; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 146; ARCHER 1985: 90
Peoples, nations, languages/everlasting dominion and kingdom (Dan 7:14)	
Dan 2:37, 38	JEFFERY 1956: 461; PORTER 1983: 111; COLLINS 1993b: 311; BAUER 1996: 159
Dan 2:44	DRIVER 1900: 89; MONTGOMERY 1927: 304; HEATON 1956: 182; JEFFERY 1956: 462; PLÖGER 1965: 112; LEBRAM 1984: 89; COLLINS 1993b: 311; BAUER 1996: 159
Dan 3:4	DRIVER 1900: 89; MONTGOMERY 1927: 304; JEFFERY 1956: 462; BALDWIN 1978: 143; COLLINS 1993b: 311; BAUER 1996: 159
Dan 3:33	CHARLES 1929: 187; YOUNG 1953: 156; PLÖGER 1965: 112; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 147; KEARNS 1982: 108, n. 80; COLLINS 1993b: 311
Dan 4:3	DRIVER 1900: 89; CHARLES 1929: 187; HEATON 1956: 182; JEFFERY 1956: 462; PLÖGER 1965: 112; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 147; KEARNS 1982: 108, n. 80; COLLINS 1993b: 311
Dan 4:31	YOUNG 1953: 156; PLÖGER 1965: 112; KEARNS 1982: 108, n. 80
Dan 5:18, 19	DRIVER 1900: 88; MONTGOMERY 1927: 304; JEFFERY 1956: 461f; PLÖGER 1965: 112; PORTER 1983: 111; COLLINS 1993b: 311; BAUER 1996: 159
Dan 6:26, 27	CHARLES 1929: 187; HEATON 1956: 182; JEFFERY 1956: 462; PLÖGER 1965: 112; LACOCQUE 1976: 111 = <i>ibid.</i> 1979: 147; KEARNS 1982: 108, n. 80; COLLINS 1993b: 311; BAUER 1996: 159

3.12. Iconographic influence

Among the multitudinous pages written on the second part of the vision of Dan 7 iconographic references are reduced to a few lines lost in an intense debate on the identity and relationship of the “Ancient of days” and the “son of man”. As in the section of the iconographic influence on the first part of the vision of Dan 7, references are discussed under subject matter.

3.12.1. The outward appearance of the “Ancient of days”

MEYER (1921: 199), followed by VON GALL (1926: 268), alluded to an iconographic parallel of the “Ancient of days” in the Achaemenid reliefs of Ahura-mazda (without giving references) by stating that the colourful Danielic description would even be of help in reconstructing the original colours of these reliefs.³⁵⁸

BAUMGARTNER (1926: 22) proposed a possible Babylonian iconographic parallel by referring to the moon-god Sin, often depicted with a long beard.³⁵⁹ While not speaking directly of an iconographic influence, MONTGOMERY (1927: 297) compared the “Ancient of days” with depictions of “Zeus in Hellenic art.”³⁶⁰

Based on his proposed Egyptian background (cf. p. 79) for the “Ancient of days”, GRESSMANN (1929: 404) adduced by referring to H. PRINZ (1915: 34f) Egyptian depictions of the sun-god as old man in the 12th hour of the sun-cycle.³⁶¹

In discussing the human-like appearance of the “son of man”, COLPE (1969: 421) noted that El as well as Baal were depicted in human-like fashion. In regard to

³⁵⁸ MEYER was severely questioned by JUNKER: “Eine Bezeichnung Ahuramazdas als Greis, die dem danielischen יְמִין עֲתִיק als Vorbild gedient hätte, ist literarisch nicht bezeugt. Ob die achämenidischen Felsreliefs ihn wirklich als Greis darstellen wollen, wie Ed. Meyer meint, scheint mehr als zweifelhaft. Ahura Mazda ist nämlich dort dargestellt, wie er in der geflügelten Sonnenscheibe über dem Könige schwebt, und zwar ist er als Kriegsgott dargestellt, wie die Achämenideninschriften deutlich beweisen, die alle Siege des Königs der Hilfe Ahura Mazdas zuschreiben. Es ist nun aber im höchsten Grade unwahrscheinlich, dass man einen Kriegsgott als hochbetagten Greis habe darstellen wollen. Diese Darstellung ist zudem gar kein original-persisches Motiv, sondern geht zweifellos auf assyrische Vorbilder zurück, die Assur in gleicher Weise darstellen” (1932: 50). References given by JUNKER in support for his criticism were: SARRE/HERZFELD 1910: 15 fig. 5, 57 fig. 18 [tombs of Artaxerxes II and III at Persepolis]; HERZFELD 1920: pl. X; GRESSMANN 1927: nos. 154, 311, 333.

³⁵⁹ GRESSMANN 1909: no. 95.

³⁶⁰ Cf. also LEBRAM 1984: 86: “Die Vorstellung könnte von, Ez. 1 herkommen, erinnert aber auch an den Wagen, des griechischen Zeus, der den Götterfeind Typhon besiegt” and HARTMAN/DI LELLA (1978: 218; followed by REID 1989: 85) who compared the “Ancient of days” with the bearded Zeus.

³⁶¹ “Aus einer Reihe ägyptischer Darstellungen kennen wir nun den Sonnengott als Hochbetagten, gebückt am Stabe schreitend, entweder *der Greis* oder *der Strahlende* genannt. Sowohl das Alter wie die Lichtnatur passen ausgezeichnet zu der Gestalt Daniels. Die Übereinstimmung geht aber noch weiter; denn derselbe Gott der letzten Stunden des Tages wird auch im Königsornat abgebildet.”

El reference was made to Ugaritic reliefs depicting El with a bearded face and with horns protruding from under his cap.³⁶²

Of all scholars KEARNS in his religio–historical study on the pre–history of the christological title “son of man” made the most iconographic references to the second part of the vision, although not all were directly linked to the imagery of Dan 7. As proponent of a Canaanite background, KEARNS (1982: 179, 184) adduced the same Ugaritic depiction of El as did COLPE.³⁶³ In regard to the outward appearance of the “Ancient of days” he pointed to the long Syrian robe and the hair worn in a lock down El’s back. Similar depictions from later times referred to by KEARNS were a depiction of the Punic equivalent³⁶⁴ of El, i.e., Baalhammon³⁶⁵ and of sitting bronze figurines from Ugarit, Cyprus, and Nablus.³⁶⁶

3.12.2. The “Ancient of days” enthroned

BAUMGARTNER (1926: 22) not only compared the outward appearance of the Babylonian moon–god Sin with the “Ancient of days”, but also his posture of sitting on a throne.³⁶⁷ The same comparison was made by KEARNS (1982: 179f) with the depiction of El from Ugarit.³⁶⁸ KEARNS acknowledged that this is not a unique feature of El, but nevertheless important in regard to his position in the council of gods.

3.12.3. The throne of the “Ancient of days”

A short reference to the throne as being a chariot (“Thronwagen”) as commonly seen on depictions of gods was made by GOETTSBERGER (1928: 55).

Three remarks, based partly on iconographic evidence, were made by KEARNS in regard to the throne. First, the second mention of the throne of the “Ancient of days” in Dan 7:9 in the singular, in contrast to the first mention in the same verse which is plural,³⁶⁹ was according to KEARNS (1982: 185) directly influenced by iconographic depictions showing only a single throne. Second, גִּלְגַּל was interpreted by KEARNS (ibid. 186f) as nimbus³⁷⁰ of the “Ancient of days”.³⁷¹ KEARNS acknowledged that there are no traditio–historical indications that the alleged aureole consisted of burning fire. But based on the sun disk surrounding El as seen on the

³⁶² COLPE 1969: 421, n. 150. Cf. SCHAEFFER 1937: 128, pl. 17.

³⁶³ PRITCHARD 1969a: no. 493.

³⁶⁴ Cf. CROSS 1973: 24–28.

³⁶⁵ CINTAS 1947: fig. 47f.

³⁶⁶ WELTEN 1977: 101.

³⁶⁷ GRESSMANN 1909: no. 95.

³⁶⁸ PRITCHARD 1969a: no. 493.

³⁶⁹ The plural is explained by KEARNS (1982: 178) as *pluralis maiestatis* and as reflection of the traditio–historical position of El in the council of gods (ibid. 185).

³⁷⁰ Cf. above n. 293 on p. 83.

³⁷¹ The suffix is explained as referring to the “Ancient of days” not to his throne (ibid. n. 454).

Ugaritic stela of El³⁷² and an iconographic reference to “a disc decorated with tongues of flames”³⁷³ he assumed that a fiery sun disk surrounding El would be the most plausible explanation for גלגל in Dan 7:9. Third, KEARNS argued that the call (*ql*) of Hadad was transformed into a fiery weapon. This transformation was facilitated by the iconography of Hadad as storm-god whose requisite, the flash of lightning,³⁷⁴ was depicted as a weapon in the form of a forked flash of lightning or a spear of lightning with tongues of fire³⁷⁵ (ibid. 142f).

3.12.4. The audience of the enthroned “Ancient of days”

An iconographic parallel for the audience of the “Ancient of days” was suggested by HERZFELD (1947: 832) when he pointed to sculptures at Persepolis which show “on the pair of doors in the front and the back wall of the Hall of Hundred Columns ... the picture of a royal audience [that] unfolds itself with numberless guards and ‘ministrants’ – more than 160 are represented – and with the king, Artaxerxes I, on the throne” (cf. SCHMIDT 1953: pls. 96f).

JEFFERY (1956: 457) saw in the assessors depicted in the Egyptian Book of the Dead as sitting above the seated judge when the fate of the soul is determined, a description similar to that of the thrones that were placed in Dan 7:9.

3.12.5. The outward appearance of the “son of man”

The outward appearance of the “son of man” as being human-like was referred to by COLPE (1969: 421 with n. 150) in pointing to Ugaritic statuettes and a relief of Baal, depicting him as a young, energetic man.³⁷⁶

3.12.6. The “son of man” coming with clouds

The first iconographic reference to the flying “son of man” was made by EMERTON. He pointed to “the imagery of a storm-god flying over the waves ... illustrated from the obverse type of certain Tyrian coins, which show a god riding a hippocamp across the sea” (1958: 236).³⁷⁷

KEARNS (1982: 102) pointed out that the epithet of Hadad “Rider of the Clouds” (*rkb 'pḥ*), from which KEARNS derived the imagery of the “son of man” coming in

³⁷² PRITCHARD 1969a: no. 493.

³⁷³ Ibid. no. 536.

³⁷⁴ KEARNS (1982: 143) pointed out that Hadad holds a *ʿs brq* (“tree of lightning”) (KTU 1.101,4). Ambiguous is *ʿs* (“tree”) in regard to the flash of lightning. It could indicate the nature of the tree being a shaft with splaying branches like tongues of fire or it could be the wooden material of the weapon.

³⁷⁵ Iconographic reference was made to VANEL 1965: 164–166.

³⁷⁶ DUSSAUD 1949: 66, fig. 29; 68, fig. 34; 69, fig. 35; 75, fig. 43.

³⁷⁷ HILL 1910: 230, no. 19, pl. 29:6 (fourth century B.C.E.). EMERTON also referred to the so-called Yehud coin (c. 400 B.C.E.) which shows on the reverse a divine figure, seated on a winged wheel (HILL 1914: 181, no. 29, pl. 19:29).

the clouds, has its iconographic basis in depictions showing the storm-god being pulled in a chariot³⁷⁸ by a *Mischwesen*.³⁷⁹

3.12.7. The investiture of the “son of man”

A single iconographic reference was made to “the way, how the Son of man is led to the presence ... of the king on the throne” by HERZFELD (1947: 833) by referring to the same scene “as represented in the entrance door of the Hall of a Hundred Columns” at Persepolis.

³⁷⁸ *rkb* designates the driving in a harnessed battle chariot (KEARNS 1982: 102, n. 52).

³⁷⁹ For iconographic references see VANEL 1965: 18, 91f, 120f, 130–132.

Abbreviations

AB	The Anchor Bible
AEO	Archives d'études orientales
AI	Acta Iranica
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
AO	Der Alte Orient
AOH	Acta Orientalia (Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae)
ASE	Archaeological Survey of Egypt
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
ATD	Altes Testament Deutsch
AThANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AUSDDS	Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bib	Biblica
Biblical books	The abbreviation system used is that of the BibleWorks for Windows Computer Bible Research Software
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BK.AT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BMS	Bibal Monograph Series
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
BVSAW.PH	Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissen- schaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZSF	Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen.
CAT	Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBOTS	Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series
CRB	Cahiers de la Revue Biblique
CTA	Cf. Herdner 1963
CUOS	Columbia University Oriental Studies
EBC	Expositor's Bible Commentary
EF	Erträge der Forschung
ET	The Expository Times
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
FOTL	The Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschung zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FrZPhTh	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie
HAB	Harper's Annotated Bible
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSAT	Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HZ	Historische Zeitschrift

ICC	The International Critical Commentary
ILN	Illustrated London News
Int	Interpretation
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KEHAT	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
KHAT	Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
Klio	Klio. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte
KST	Kohlhammer Studienbücher Theologie
KTU	Cf. Dietrich/Loretz/Sanmartín 1976
MAOG	Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft
MMAIBL	Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres
NE	Die Neue Echter Bibel
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
NSK.AT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Altes Testament
NTG	Neue theologische Grundrisse
NTL	The New Testament Library
NTS	New Testament Studies
UF	Ugarit Forschungen
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OIP	The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications
OP	Orbis Pictus
Or	Orientalia
OTS	Old Testament Studies
QDAP	Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine
RA	Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale
RB	Revue Biblique
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1932–
RWB	Religionswissenschaftliche Bibliothek
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
Sem	Semitica
SNVAO.HF	Skrifter det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse
SPB	Studia Post-Biblica
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
STh	Studia Theologica
StNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
ThRv	Theologische Revue
ThStKr	Theologische Studien und Kritiken

ThWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament
TOTC	The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
UF	Ugarit-Forschungen
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VT.S	Vetus Testamentum Supplementum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WRATR	Aus der Welt der Religion. Alttestamentliche Reihe
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZPapuEp	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZBAT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare Altes Testament
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZNWuKU	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

Bibliography

Aistleitner J.

1955 "Ein Opfertext aus Ugarit (No. 53). Mit Exkurs über kosmologische Beziehungen der ugaritischen Mythologie," AOH 5:1-23.

³1967 Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache (BVSAW.PH 106,3). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Albright W.F.

1940 From the Stone Age to Christianity. Monotheism and the Historical Process. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.

Archer G.L.

1985 Daniel. (EBC 7). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House.

Baldwin J.G.

1978 Daniel. An Introduction and Commentary. (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity.

Balz H.R.

1967 Methodische Probleme der neutestamentlichen Christologie. (WMANT 25). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag.

Barker M.

1987 The Older Testament. The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity. London, SPCK.

Bartelmus R.

1993 "Die Tierwelt in der Bibel II: Tiersymbolik im Alten Testament – exemplarisch dargestellt am Beispiel von Dan 7, Ez 1/10 und Jes 11,68," in: Gefährten und Feinde des Menschen. Das Tier in der Lebenswelt des alten Israel. Eds.: B. Janowski, U. Neumann-Gorsolke, and U. Glessmer. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag: 283-306.

Bauer D.

1996 Das Buch Daniel. (NSK.AT 22). Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Bauer H.

1933 "Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra," ZAW 51:81-101.

Baumgartner W.

1926 Das Buch Daniel. (WRATR 1). Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann.

1939 "Ein Vierteljahrhundert Danielforschung," ThR 11:59-83, 125-44, 201-228.

Beasley-Murray G.R.

1938 "The Interpretation of Daniel 7," CBQ 45:44-58.

Beek M.A.

1935 Das Danielbuch. Sein historischer Hintergrund und seine literarische Entwicklung. Versuch eines Beitrags zur Lösung des Problems. Leiden: J. Ginsberg.

Behrmann G.

1894 Das Buch Daniel. (HKAT III.3.2). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bentzen A.

1937 Daniel. (HAT 19). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

²1952 Daniel. (HAT 19). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

1948 Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn. Skizzen zum Thema Weissagung und Erfüllung. (AThANT 17). Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag.

1955 King and Messiah. London: Lutterworth Press. (English translation of Bentzen 1948).

²1970 King and Messiah. Editor G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Bevan A.A.
1892 A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel. For the Use of Students. Cambridge: At the University Press.
- Bewer J.A.
1955 The Book of Daniel: In the King James Version with Introduction and Critical Notes. (HAB 12). New York/London: Harper & Brothers/Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Bickermann E.
1967 Four Strange Books of the Bible. Jonah / Daniel / Koheleth / Esther. New York: Schocken Books.
- Biggs R.D.
1969 "Ludlul bēl nēmeqi," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:596–600.
- Black M.
1975 "Die Apotheose Israels: eine neue Interpretation des danielischen 'Menschensohns'," in: Jesus und der Menschensohn. Für Anton Vögtle. Hrsg.: R. Pesch/R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder.
1976 "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man': A Study in Tradition-History," Jews, Greeks and Christians. Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies. Eds. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
1985 The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A New English Edition. (SVTP 7). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Boll F.
1914 Aus der Offenbarung Johannis. Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse. (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ 1, Studien zur Geschichte des Antiken Weltbildes und der griechischen Wissenschaft). Leipzig/Berlin: B.G. Teubner.
- Borsch F.H.
1967 The Son of Man in Myth and History. (NTL). London: SCM Press.
- Bousset W.
1903 Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard.
²1906 Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard.
1907 Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. (FRLANT 10). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bousset W./Gressmann H.
1926 Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. (HNT 21). 3rd edition of Bousset 1903. Ed.: H. Gressmann. Berlin: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Bowman J.
1947–48 "The Background of the Term 'Son of Man'," ET 59:283–288.
- Bryan D.
1995 Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality. (JSPSup 12). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Caquot A.
1955 "Sur les quatre bêtes de Daniel VII," Sem 5:7–13.
1967 "Les quatre bêtes et le 'fils d'homme' (Daniel 7)," Sem 17:37–71.
- Caragounis C.C.
1986 The Son of Man. Vision and Interpretation. (WUNT 38). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

- Carter H./Newberry P.E.
 1904 The Tomb of Thoutmôsis IV (Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, N^{os} 46001–46529). Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co.
- Casey M.
 1978 Son of Man. The Interpretation and influence of Daniel 7. London: SPCK.
- Caspari W.
 1925 "Die Gottesgestalt in Daniel," NKZ 36:175–199.
- Charles R.H.
 1929 A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Christensen A.
 1917 Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des Iraniens I. (AEO 14). Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt.
- Cintas P.
 1947 "Le Sanctuaire punique de Sousse," RA 91:1–80.
- Clemen C.
 1909 Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Die Abhängigkeit des ältesten Christentums von nichtjüdischen Religionen und philosophischen Systemen. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Clifford R.J.
 1984 "Cosmogonies in the Ugaritic Texts and the Bible," Or 53:193–201.
- Collins J.J.
 1975 "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," VT 25:596–612.
 1977 The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel. (HSM 16). Missoula: Scholars Press.
 1981 "Apocalyptic Genre and Mythic Allusions in Daniel," JSOT 21:83–100.
 1984 Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature. (FOTL 20). Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans.
 1993a "Stirring Up the Great Sea. The Religio–Historical Background of Daniel 7," in: The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings. (BETL 106), Ed.: A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters: 121–136.
 1993b Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel: With an Essay, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," by Adela Yarbro Collins. (Hermeneia). Ed.: F.M. Cross. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Colpe C.
 1961 Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus. (FRLANT 78). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 1969 "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου," in: ThWNT 8:403–481.
 1981 Review of Kearns 1978 in: ThRv 77: cols. 373–378.
- Coppens J.
 1955 "Le Messianisme Sapiential et les origines littéraires du Fils de l'homme Daniélique," in: Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley in Celebration of His Sixty–Fifth Birthday, 24 March 1955. (VT.S 3). Ed.: M. Noth/D.W. Thomas. Leiden: E.J. Brill: 33–41.
 1961 "Le Fils d'homme daniélique et les relecteurs de Dan., VII,13, dans les apocryphes et les écrites du Nouveau Testament," ETL 37:5–51.
 1963 "Miscellanées bibliques: XXXI. Le serviteur de Yahvé et le Fils d'homme daniélique sont-ils des figures messianiques?," ETL 39:104–113.
 1964 "Le Fils d'homme daniélique vizir céleste?," ETL 40:72–80.

- 1968 "Miscellanées bibliques: L. Les origines du symbole du Fils d'homme en Dan. VII," ETL 44:497-502.
- 1969 "Un nouvel essai d'interpréter Dan., VII," ETL 45:122-125.
- Crenshaw J.L.
1992 *Old Testament Story and Faith. A Literary and Theological Introduction.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers (reprint of: *Story and Faith: A Guide to the Old Testament.* Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986).
- Cross F.M.
1973 *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cross F.M./Freedman D.N.
1947 "A Note on Deuteronomy 33:26," BASOR 108:6-7.
- Cumont F.
1909 "La plus ancienne géographie astrologique," Klio 9:263-273.
- Dahood M.
1965 *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. Marginal Notes on Recent Publications.* (BibOr 17). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
1968 *Psalms II. 51-100.* (AB 17). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Darssey M.G.
1902 *Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois (Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, N^{os} 24001-24990).* Le Caire: L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale.
- Davies N. de. G.
1905a *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna. Part II. - The Tombs of Panehesy and Meryra II.* (ASE 14). London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
1905b *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna. Part III. -The Tombs of Huya and Ahmes.* (ASE 15). London. Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Davis T.M.
1912 *The Tombs of Harmhabi and Touatânkhamanou.* London: Constable and Company.
- Day J.
1985 *God's conflict with the dragon and the sea. Echoes of a Canaanite myth in the Old Testament.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delaporte L.
1910 *Catalogue des cylindres orientaux et des cachets Assyro-Babyloniens, Perses et Syro-Cappadociens de la Bibliothèque Nationale.* Paris: Ernest LeRoux.
- Delcor M.
1968 "Les sources du chapitre VII de Daniel," VT 18:290-312.
1971 *Le livre de Daniel.* Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie.
- Dexinger F.
1969 *Das Buch Daniel und seine Problem.* (SBS 36). Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Dhanis E.
1964 "De filio hominis in Vetere Testamento et in Iudaismo," Gregorianum 45:5-59.
- Dietrich, M./Loretz, O./Sanmartín, J.
1976 *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit. Einschliesslich der keilalphabetischen Texte ausserhalb Ugarits.* (AOAT 24). Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/Neukirchner Verlag.
- Dodd C.H.
1952 *According to Scriptures. The Sub-Structures of New Testament Theology.* London: Nisbet.

- Donner H./Röllig W.
²1968 Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften. Vol. II. Kommentar. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Doukhan J.B.
 1989 Daniel. Die Vision vom Ende. Zürich: Advent-Verlag.
- Drews A.
 1910 Die Christusmythe. Jena: Eugen Diedrichs.
- Driver G.R.
 1926 "The Psalms in the Light of Babylonian Research," in: The Psalmists. Essays on their religious experience and teaching, their social background, and their place in the development of Hebrew Psalmody. Ed.: D.C. Simpson. London: Oxford University Press: 109–175.
 1956 Canaanite Myths and Legends. (OTS 3). Edinburgh: T & T. Clark.
- Driver S.R.
 1900 The Book of Daniel. With Introduction and Notes. Reprint: Cambridge: at the University Press, 1912.
- Dupont-Sommer A.
 1960 "Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré [Stèles I et II]," MMAIBL 15:197–351.
- Dussaud R.
 1949 L'Art Phénicien du II^e Millénaire. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Ebeling E.
 1931 Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier I. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
 1937 "Kritische Beiträge zu neueren assyrologischen Veröffentlichungen," MAOG 10:1–20.
- Eichrodt W.
 1935 Theologie des Alten Testaments. Teil 2: Gott und die Welt. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
⁴1961 Theologie des Alten Testaments. Vol. II and III. Stuttgart/Göttingen: Ehrenfried Klotz/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Eisler R.
 1930 ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ. Die messianische Unabhängigkeitsbewegung vom Auftreten Johannes des Täuflers bis zum Untergang Jakobs des Gerechten nach der neuerschlossenen Eroberung von Jerusalem des Flavius Josephus und den christlichen Quellen. (RWB 9). Heidelberg. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Eissfeldt O.
 1932 Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
 1934 Einleitung in das Alte Testament. (NTG). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1945–49 "Ugaritisches," ZDMG 99:29–42.
²1956a Einleitung in das Alte Testament. (NTG). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1956b "El and Yahweh," JJS 1:25–37.
- Emerton J.
 1958 "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," JTS 9:225–242.
- Ewald H.
 1868 Die Propheten des Alten Bundes. Dritter Band: Die jüngsten Propheten des Alten Bundes mit den Büchern Barukh und Daniel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Farrer A.M.
1951 A Study in St. Mark. London: Westminster.
- Ferch A.J.
1979 The Son of Man in Daniel 7. (AUSDDS 6). Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press.
1980 "Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration," JBL 99:75–87.
- Feuillet A.
1953 "Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique," RB 60:170–202, 321–346.
- Fitzmyer J.A.
1967 The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. (BibOr 19). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Fohrer G.
1968 Introduction to the Old Testament. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Frank C.
1941 "Lamastu, Pazuzu und andere Dämonen. Ein Beitrag zur babyl.–assyrl. Dämonologie," MAOG 14:23–41.
- Gadd C.J.
1929 History and Monuments of Ur. London: Chatto & Windus.
- von Gall A. Freiherr
1926 ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Vorkirchlichen Eschatologie. (RWB 7). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Gese H.
1983 "Die Bedeutung der Krise unter Antiochus IV. Epiphanes für die Apokalyptik des Danielbuches," ZTK 80:372–388.
- Gibson J.C.L.
1978 Canaanite Myths and Legends. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Ginsberg H.L.
1969 "Poems about Baal and Anath," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:129–142.
- Glasson T.F.
1976 "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch XIV and Daniel VII," NTS 23:82–90.
- Goettsberger J.
1928 Das Buch Daniel. (HSAT). Bonn: Peter Hanstein.
- Goetze A.
1969 "The Song of Ullikummi," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:121–125.
- Goldingay J.E.
1988 Daniel. (WBC 30). Dallas: Word Books.
- Gordon C.
1940 Ugaritic Grammar. The Present Status of the Linguistic Study of the Semitic Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra. (AnOr 20). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
1976 "El, Father of Šnm," JNES 35:261–262.
- Goodenough E.R.
1958 Jewish Symbols in the Greco–Roman Period. Volume Eight: Pagan Symbols in Judaism (The second of two volumes). (Bollingen Series 37), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Grapow H.
1924 Die bildlichen Ausdrücke des Ägyptischen. Vom Denken und Dichten einer altorientalischen Sprache. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung Reprint: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983.

- Grayson A.K.
 1969a "The Creation Epic," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:501–503.
 1969b "The Epic of Gilgamesh," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:503–507.
- Grelot P.
 1975 "Daniel VII,1–0 et le livre d'Hénoch," Sem 28:59–83.
- Gressmann H.
 1905 Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 1909 Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1925 Die hellenistische Gestirnsreligion. J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung.
 1927 Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
 1929 Der Messias. (FRLANT 43). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Grill J.
 1902 Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums. Erster Teil. Tübingen/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Grønbaek J.H.
 1985 "Baal's Battle with Yam – A Canaanite Creation Fight," JSOT 33:27–44.
- Gunkel H.
 1895 Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 and Ap Joh 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 1910 Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Haag E.
 1993a "Der Menschensohn und die Heiligen (des) Höchsten," in: The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings. (BETL 106), Ed.: A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters: 137–184.
 1993b Daniel. (NE). Würzburg: Echter-Verlag.
- Halperin D.J.
 1988 The Faces of the Chariot. Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision. TSAJ 16) Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Hammer R.
 1976 The Book of Daniel. (The Cambridge Bible Commentary). Cambridge/London/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartman L.F./Di Lella A.
 1978 The Book of Daniel. (AB 23). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Heaton E.W.
 1956 The Book of Daniel. (TBC). London: SCM.
- Heidel A.
 1949 The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press.
 1951 The Babylonian Genesis. The Story of the Creation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- van Henten J.W.
 1993 "Antiochus IV as a Typhonic Figure in Daniel 7," in: The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings. (BETL 106), Ed.: A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters: 223–243.

- Herdner, A.
1963 *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques. Découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939. (Mission de Ras Shamra 10).* Paris: Imprimerie National/Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Hertlein E.
1911 *Die Menschensohnfrage im letzten Stadium. Ein Versuch zur Einsicht in das Wesen altchristlichen Schrifttums.* Berlin/Stuttgart/Leipzig: W. Kohlhammer.
- Herzfeld E.
1920 *Am Tor von Asien.* Berlin. Dietrich Reimer/Ernst Vohsen.
1947 *Zoroaster and his World. Vol. II.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hill G.F.
1910 *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia.* London: Trustees of the British Museum.
1914 *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine.* London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Hilzheimer M.
1928 "Bär," *RIA* 1:398–399.
- Hitzig F.
1850 *Das Buch Daniel. (KEHAT 10).* Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung.
- Hölscher G.
1919 "Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel," *ThStKr* 92:113–138.
- Hommel F.
1899 "The Apocalyptic Origin of the Expression 'Son of Man'," *ET* 341–345.
- Hooker M.D.
1967 *The Son of Man in Mark. A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St Mark's Gospel.* London. SPCK.
- Huehnergard J.
1987 *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription. (HSS 32).* Atlanta: Scholar Press.
- Hutter M.
1996 *Religionen in der Umwelt des Alten Testaments I. Babylonier, Syrer, Perser. (KST 4,1).* Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: W. Kohlhammer.
- Imhoof-Blumer F.
1885 *Porträtköpfe auf antiken Münzen hellenischer und hellenisierter Völker.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Jack J.W.
1935 *The Ras Shamra Tablets: Their Bearing on the Old Testament. (OTS 1).* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Jacobsen T.
1968 "The Battle between Marduk and Tiamat," *JAOS* 88:104–108.
- Jansen H.L.
1939 *Die Henochgestalt. Eine vergleichende Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. (SNVAO.HF 1939,1).* Oslo: A.W. Brøgers Boktrykkeri.
- Jastrow M.
1912 *Bildermappe mit 273 Abbildungen samt Erklärungen zur Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens.* Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Jeffery A.
1956 "The Book of Daniel," in: *Interpreter's Bible.* Ed.: G.A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon: 339–549.
- Jenkins G.K.
1972 *Monnaies grecques.* Fribourg: Office du Livre.

- Jeremias A.
 1899 "Oannes-Ea," in: Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Vol. 3/1. Ed.: W. H. Roscher. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner: 577–594.
 1913 Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskulutr. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
³1916 Das Alte Testament im Lichter des Alten Orients. Leipzig. J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
²1929 Handbuch der Altorientalischen Geisteskultur. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Jirku A.
 1970 "Šnm (Schunama), der Sohn des Gottes 'Il," ZAW 82:278–279.
- Junker H.
 1932 Untersuchungen über literarische und exegetische Probleme des Buches Daniel. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Kalthoff A.
 1904 Die Entstehung des Christentums. Leipzig: Eugen Diederichs.
- Kapellrud A.S.
 1952 Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad.
- Kearns R.
 1978 Vorfragen zur Christologie. I: Morphologische und Semasiologische Studie zur Vorgeschichte eines christlichen Hoheitstitels. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1982 Vorfragen zur Christologie. III: Religionsgeschichtliche und Traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Vorgeschichte eines christologischen Hoheitstitels. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1978 Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. Eine Entgegnung von Ijob 38–41 vor dem Hintergrund der zeitgenössischen Bildkunst. (FRLANT 121). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Keel O./Staub U.
 2000 Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Skizzen zu Daniel 7 und der Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV. (OBO 178). Freiburg Schweiz/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Keil C.F.
 1872 The Book of the Prophet Daniel. (Commentary on the Old Testament). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Reprint: Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes. Volume 9: Ezekiel, Daniel, Eds. C.F. Keil/F. Delitzsch). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1986 = Kommentar über den Propheten Daniel (Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament 3/5). Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1869.
- Kittel R.
 1924 Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das Alte Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Kloos C.
 1986 Yhwh's Combat with the Sea. A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel. Amsterdam/Leiden: G. A. van Oorschot/E. J. Brill.
- Koch K.
 1961 "Spätisraelitisches Geschichtsdenken am Beispiel des Buches Daniel," HZ 193:1–32.
 1980 Das Buch Daniel. (EF 144). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Koenen L.
 1968 "Die Prophezeiungen des Töpfers," ZPapuEp 2:178–209.

- Kraeling C.H.
1927 *Anthropos and Son of Man: A Study in the Religious Syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient.* (CUOS 25). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kraeling E.G.H.
1933 "Some Babylonian and Iranian Mythology in the Seventh Chapter of Daniel," in: *Oriental Studies. In Honour of Cursetji Erachji Pavry.* Ed.: J.D.C. Pavry. London: Oxford University Press: 228–232.
- Kratz R.G.
1991 *Translatio imperii. Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld.* (WMANT 63). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Kruse H.
1959 "Compositio Libri Danielis et idea Filii Hominis," *Verbum domini* 37:147–161, 192–211.
- Kuhn K.G.
1959 *Der tannaitische Midrasch. Sifre zu Numeri.* (Rabbinische Texte 2. Reihe, 3. Band). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Kvanvig H.S.
1981 "An Akkadian Vision as Background for Dan 7?," *STh* 35:85–89.
1984 "Henoch und der Menschensohn. Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7," *STh* 38:101–133.
1988 *Roots of Apocalyptic. The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man.* (WMANT 61). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Lacocque A.
1976 *Le Livre de Daniel.* (CAT 15b). Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.
1979 *The Book of Daniel.* (Engl. translation of Lacocque 1976). London: SPCK.
- Lambert W.
1965 "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis," *JTS* 16:287–300.
- Lange K.
1938 *Herrscherköpfe des Altertums im Münzbild ihrer Zeit.* Berlin/Zürich: Atlantis.
- Layard A.H.
1853 *A Second Series of the Monuments of Niniveh; including bas-reliefs from the Palace of Sennacherib and bronzes from the ruins of Nimroud. from Drawings Made on the Spot, during a Second Expedition to Assyria.* London: John Murray.
1854 *Niniveh und seine Ueberreste. Nebst einem Bericht über einen Besuch bei den chaldäischen Christen in Kurdistan und den Jezidi oder Teufelsanbetern sowie einer Untersuchung über die Sitten und Künste der alten Assyrier.* Leipzig: Verlag der Dyk'schen Buchhandlung.
- Lebram J.C.H.
1975 "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel," *VT* 25:737–772.
1984 *Das Buch Daniel.* (ZBAT 23). Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.
- von Lengerke C.
1835 *Das Buch Daniel.* Königsberg: Gebrüder Bornträger.
- Leupold H.C.
1969 *Exposition of Daniel.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House (Reprint of the 1949 edition of the Wardburg Press).
- Lindars B.
1975 "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 22:52–72.
- Longenecker R.
1969 "'Son of Man' as Self-Designation of Jesus," *JETS* 12:151–158.

- Lucas E.C.
 1990 "The Source of Daniel's Animal Imagery," *TynBul* 41:161–185.
 2000 "Daniel: Resolving the Enigma," *VT* 50:66–80.
- Maier G.
 1982 *Der Prophet Daniel*. (Wuppertaler Studienbibel). Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus.
- Marti D.K.
 1901 *Das Buch Daniel*. (KHAT 18). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- McCown C.C.
 1925 "Hebrew and Egyptian Apocalyptic Literature," *HTR* 18:357–411.
- Meissner B.
 1925 *Babylonien und Assyrien*. Vol 2. (Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek. I. Reihe: Ethnologische Bibliothek 4). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Meyer E.
 1921 *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. Zweiter Band. Die Entwicklung des Judentums und Jesus von Nazaret. Stuttgart/Berlin: J.G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung.
- Meyer R.
 1938 "λαός," in: *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Band 4. Ed.: G. Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer: 29–56.
- Montgomery J. A.
 1927 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. (ICC). Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
 1933 "Notes on the Mythological Epic Texts from Ras Shamra," *JAOS* 53:97–123.
- Morenz S.
 1951 "Das Tier mit den Hörnern, ein Beitrag zu Dan 7 7 f.," *ZAW* 63:151–53.
- de Morgan J.
 1905 *Délégation en Perse: Mémoires*. Tome VII. *Recherches archéologiques*. Deuxième série. Ed.: J. De Morgan. Paris: Ernest LeRoux.
- Morgenstern J.
 1960 "The King-God among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes," *VT* 10:138–197.
 1961 "The 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7 13 f. A New Interpretation," *JBL* 80:65–77.
 1965 *Some Significant Antecedents of Christianity*. (SPB 10). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Mosca P.G.
 1986 "Ugarit and Daniel 7: A Missing Link," *Bib* 67:496–517.
- Mowinckel S.
 1922 *Psalmstudien*. II. *Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (Videnskapsselskapets Skrifter. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse 1921. No. 6). Kristiana: Jacob Dybwad = Reprint: *Psalmstudien*. Buch I–II. Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1961.
 1955 *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. New York/Nashville: Basil Blackwell.
- Muilenburg J.
 1960 "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *JBL* 79:197–209.
- Müller U.B.
 1972 *Messias und Menschensohn in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes*. (StNT 6). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Münter D.F.
 1827 *Religion der Babylonier*. Kopenhagen: Johann Heinrich Schubothe.

- Naville E.
1906 Temple of Deir el Bahari. Part V. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- Newell E.T.
1937 Royal Greek Portrait Coins. Wisconsin: Wayne Raymond.
- Noth M.
1957 "Das Geschichtsverständnis der alttestamentlichen Apokalyptik," *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*. (Theologische Bücherei. Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert. Altes Testament. Band 6). München: Chr. Kaiser = Reprint of: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Geisteswissenschaft. Heft 21. Sitzung am 12. Oktober 1953 in Düsseldorf. Westdeutscher Verlag Köln und Opladen (1954).
- Oden R.A.
1977 "Ba'al Šamēm and 'Ēl," *CBQ* 39:457-473.
- Oesterley W.O.E.
1941 *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- Oldenburg U.
1970 *The Conflict between El and Ba'al in Canaanite Religion* (Dissertationes ad historiam religionum pertinentes 3). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Oppenheim A.L.
1962 "Sargon," in: *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 4. Ed.: G.A. Buttrick. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press: 222-224.
1969 "Nabonidus' Rise to Power," in: *PRITCHARD* 1969b:308-311.
- Otto R.
1934 *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Ein Religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Parrot A.
²1962 *Sumer*. (Universum der Kunst). Ed.: A. Miraux and G. Salles. München: C.H. Beck.
- Perrot G./Chipiez C.
1884 *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*. Vol. II: Chaldée et assyrie. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.
- Pfleiderer O.
1903 *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
- Plöger O.
1959 *Theokratie und Eschatologie*. (WMANT 2). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
1965 *Das Buch Daniel*. (KAT 18). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Pope M.
1955 *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. (VT.S 2). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Porteous N.W.
1962 *Das Danielbuch*. (ATD 23). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Porter P.A.
1983 *Metaphors and Monsters. A literary-critical study of Daniel 7 and 8*. (CBOTS 20). Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Prinz H.
1915 *Altorientalische Symbolik*. Berlin: Karl Curtius.
- Pritchard J.
1954 *Ancient Near Eastern in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
²1969a *Ancient Near Eastern in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- ³1969b Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Procksch O.
1920 "Die Berufungsvision Hesekiels," in: Karl Budde zum Siebzigsten Geburtstag am 13. April 1920 überreicht von Freunden und Schülern. (BZAW 34). Ed.: K. Marti. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann: 141–149.
- von Rad G.
1965 Old Testament Theology. Vol. 2. Edinburgh.
- Reid S.B.
1989 Enoch and Daniel. A Form Critical and Sociological Study of Historical Apocalypses. (BMS 2). Berkeley: Bibal Press.
- Reifenberg A.
1940 Ancient Jewish Coins, Jerusalem: Rubin Mass.
- Reitzenstein R.
1904 Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur. Reprint: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Rhodes A.B.
1961 "The Kingdoms of Men and the Kingdom of God: A Study of Daniel 7:1–14," Int 15:411–30.
- Rimbach J.A.
1978 "Bears or Bees? Sefire I A 31 and Daniel 7," JBL 97:565–66.
- Root M.C.
1979 The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. (AI 19) Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Rost L.
1958 "Zur Deutung des Menschensohnes in Daniel 7," Gott und die Götter. Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag. Ed.: G. Dellling. Berlin: W. Kohlhammer: 41–43 = "Zur Deutung des Menschensohnes in Daniel 7," Studien zum Alten Testament. (BWANT 101). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1974: 72–75.
- Rowland Ch.
1982 The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity. London: SPCK.
- Russell D.S.
1964 The Method & Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. 200 BC – AD 100. London: SCM Press.
- Rutten M.
1938 "Les animaux a attitudes humaines dans l'art de l'ancienne Mésopotamie," Revue des Études Sémitiques: 97–119.
- Sahlin H.
1969 "Antiochus IV. Epiphanes und Judas Mackabäus," STh 23:41–68.
- Sarre F.
1922 Die Kunst des alten Persien. Berlin: Bruno Cassirer Verlag.
- Sarre F./Herzfeld E.
1910 Iranische Felsreliefs. Aufnahmen und Untersuchungen von Denkmälern aus alt- und mittelpersischer Zeit. Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth.
- Sellin E.
1909 Die israelitisch-jüdische Heilandserwartung. (BZSF 5,2/3). Gr. Lichterfelde-Berlin: Edwin Runge.
1933 Israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte. Alttestamentliche Theologie auf Religionsgeschichtlicher Grundlage. Erster Teil. Leipzig: Verlag von Quelle & Meyer.
- Schaeffer C.F.A.
1937 "Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Huitième campagne (printemps 1936)," Syria 18:125–154.

- Schmidt E.F.
1953 Persepolis. I: Structures, Reliefs, Inscriptions. (OIP 68), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schmidt J.M.
1971 Die jüdische Apokalyptik. Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Schmidt N.
1900 "The 'Son of Man' in the Book of Daniel," JBL 19:22–28.
1926 "Recent Study of the Term 'Son of Man'," JBL 45:326–349.
- Schmidt W.
1966 Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. (BZAW 80). Berlin: Töpelmann.
- Schrader E.
1894 "Nergal," in: Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Altertums für gebildete Bibelleser. Vol II: M bis Z. Ed.: E.C.A. Riehm. Bielefeld/Leipzig: von Velhagen & Klasing: 1090–1091.
- Schrader E./Zimmern H./Winckler H.
1903 Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard.
- Shea W.
1976 "Adam in Ancient Mesopotamian Traditions," AUSS 15:27–41.
- Smith J.P.
1903 A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Pyhne Smith, D.D. Reprint: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Smith M.S.
1986 "Interpreting the Baal Cycle," UF 18:313–339.
- von Soden W.
1936 "Die Unterwelts Vision eines assyrischen Kronprinzen," ZA 43:1–31.
1938 "Altbabylonische Dialektdichtungen," ZA 44:26–44.
- Speiser E.A.
1969a "The Creation Epic," in: Pritchard 1969b:60–72.
1969b "The Epic of Gilgamesh," in: Pritchard 1969b:72–99.
1969c "A Vision of the Nether World," in: Pritchard 1969b:109, 110.
1969d "The Myth of Zu," in: Pritchard 1969b:111–113.
- Staub U.
1978 "Das Tier mit den Hörnern. Ein Beitrag zu Dan 7, 7 f.," FrZPhTh 25:356–397 (republished in: KEEL/STAUB 2000).
- Staubli Th.
1997 Begleiter durch das Erste Testament, Düsseldorf: Patmos.
- Staerk W.
1938 Die Erlösungserwartung in den östlichen Religionen. Untersuchungen zu den Ausdrucksformen der biblischen Christologie (Soter II). Stuttgart/Berlin: W. Kohlhammer.
- Steinmann J.
1950 Daniel. (Témoins de dieu 12). Paris: Les éditions du Cerf.
1960 Daniel. (Connaître la Bible). Desclée de Brouwer.
- Stier F.
1934 Gott und sein Engel im Alten Testament. (ATA 12,2). Münster: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
1961 "Adam," in: Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe. Band I: Adam bis Kult. Ed.: H. Fries. München: Kösel: 13–25.

- Strack H.L./Billerbeck P.
 1922 Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch. (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch 1). München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Tengström S.
 1993 "Les visions prophétiques du trône de Dieu et leur arrière-plan dans l'Ancien Testament," in: *Le Trône de Dieu*. (WUNT 2:69). Ed.: M. Philonenko. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): 28–99.
- Toscanne P.
 1911 "Études sur le serpent: Figure et symbole dans l'antiquité Élamite," in: *Délégation en Perse: Mémoires. Tome XII. Recherches archéologiques. Quatrième série*. Ed.: J. de Morgan. Paris: Ernest LeRoux: 153–228.
- Towner W.S.
 1984 *Daniel*. (Interpretation). Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Tsumura D.T.
 1989 *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2. A Linguistic Investigation*. (JSOTSS 83), Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Uehlinger Ch.
 1995 "Mischwesen," in: *Neues Bibel-Lexikon. Band II. H–N*. Eds.: M. Görg and B. Lang. Zürich/Düsseldorf: Benzinger: 817–821.
- Vanel A.
 1965 *L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage*. (CRB 3). Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie.
- Virolleaud C.
 1931 "Un poème phénicien de Ras-Shamra," *Syria* 12:193–224.
- Völter D.
 1902 "Der Menschensohn in Dan 7,13.," in: *ZNWuKU* 3:173–174.
- Volz P.
 1903 *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*. Tübingen/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
 1934 *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter: nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur*. 2nd edition of Volz 1903.
- Weber O.
 1920 *Altorientalische Siegelbilder*. 1. Band. Text. 2. Band: Abbildungen. (AO 17 & 18). Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
 1922 *Die Kunst der Hethiter*. (OP 9). Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth.
- Welch A.C.
 1922 *Visions of the End. A Study in Daniel and Revelation*. London: James Clarke & Co.
- Welles C.B.
 1986 "Die hellenistische Welt," in: *Propyläen Weltgeschichte. Vol. 3: Griechenland; Die hellenistische Welt*. Eds.: G. Mann and A. Heuss. Berlin/Frankfurt: Propyläen Verlag: 403–571.
- Welten P.
 1977 "Götterbild, männliches," in: *Biblisches Reallexikon*. (HAT 1). Ed.: K. Galling. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): 99–111.
- West E.W.
 1880 *Pahlavi Texts. Part I. The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shâyast Lâ-Shâyast*. (The Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 5, Editor: F.M. Müller). Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Westermann C.
 1974 *Genesis*. (BK.AT 1). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

- Widengren G.
1969 Religionsphänomenologie. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Wiedemann A.
1920 Das alte Ägypten. (Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek. I. Reihe: Ethnologische Bibliothek mit Einschluss der altorientalischen Kulturgeschichte, 2). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Wifall W.
1974 "David – Prototype of Israel's Future?," BTB 4:94–107.
- Wilson J.A.
1969a "Astarte and the Tribute of the Sea," in: PRITCHARD 1969b:17,18.
1969b "The Prophecy of Neferti," in: Pritchard 1969b:444–446.
- Winckler H.
1905 Altorientalische Forschungen. (Dritte Reihe. Band II Heft 2). Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer.
- Wittstruck T.
1975 "The Influence of Treaty Curse Imagery on the Beast Imagery of Daniel 7," JBL 97:100–102.
- Woolley C.L.
²n.d. Vor 5000 Jahren. Die Ausgrabungen von Ur und die Geschichte der Sumerer. Stuttgart: Franckh'sche Verlagshandlung.
- Young E.J.
1953 The Prophecy of Daniel. A Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm.B. Eerdmans.
1954 The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm.B. Eerdmans.
- Zevit Z.
1968 "The Structure and Individual Elements of Daniel 7," ZAW 80:385–396.

Index of authors

A

Aistleitner · 60
Albright · 57
Archer · 44, 104, 106

B

Babelon · 48
Baldwin · 33, 36f, 39, 41f,
103–106
Balz · 39, 41, 94, 98, 101,
104, 106
Barker · 17
Bartelmus · 44–46
Barton · 3
Bauer · 32f, 36–41, 44f,
50f, 54, 58, 60, 102–106
Baumgartner · 5f, 10, 31,
38–47, 54, 58, 72, 76,
80, 100f, 107f
Beasley–Murray · 12, 56,
63, 66, 69, 88, 93, 105
Beek · 6f, 31, 36, 38–41, 44
Behrmann · 43f
Bentzen · 5, 10, 29, 31, 36,
39, 41, 43f, 46, 48, 58,
76f, 89, 95f, 101f, 104,
106, 115
Bevan · 18
Bewer · 92, 105
Bickermann · 17, 41, 43f,
48
Biggs · 86
Black · 93, 99f, 104f
Boll · 15f
Borsch · 73–74, 89
Bousset · 72–74, 77, 116
Bowman · 92, 98f
Bryan · 14, 22, 26–28, 39,
44, 102
Burkitt · 15

C

Caquot · 14–18, 54, 57f,
100f

Caragounis · 14, 57, 60f,
71, 74, 81, 88, 90, 93,
100, 102
Carter · 47
Casey · 7, 14f, 17, 33, 36–
39, 42, 55, 70, 88, 101–
103, 107
Caspari · 82, 103–105
Charles · 28, 36–42, 44, 82,
102f, 105f
Cheyne · 3
Christensen · 73, 76
Cintas · 108
Claudianus · 75
Clay · 62
Clemen · 73f
Clifford · 7
Collins · 7, 9, 13–15, 17,
19f, 22, 26f, 29, 31f,
36–48, 50, 54, 60f, 64f,
67–71, 76, 80f, 87, 100–
106, 117
Colpe · 11, 32, 42, 57, 59–
62, 65, 67f, 70–74, 76,
80f, 96, 100–102, 107–
109
Coppens · 14, 17, 37, 39f,
60, 70f, 91, 101, 104
Crenshaw · 42, 67
Cross · 12, 60, 64, 66, 70,
108, 117
Cross/Freedman · 64
Cullmann · 95
Cumont · 15

D

Dahood · 60, 97
Darssey · 48
Davies · 48, 116
Davis · 48

Day · 12, 14f, 17f, 20, 26,
31f, 38–42, 44, 47, 54,
60, 66f, 70, 76, 81, 87,
93, 96, 102, 105

Delaporte · 46f
Delcor · 7, 11f, 14, 17, 36–
41, 44f, 54, 57, 59f, 77,
91, 101–106
Dexinger · 95
Dhanis · 90
Dietrich/Loretz/Sanmartin ·
112
Dodd · 92
Donner/Röllig · 83
Doukhan · 7, 14, 31f
Drews · 75, 77
Driver G.R. · 6, 11f, 42, 70
Driver S.R. · 28, 39–42, 82,
102–106
Dupont–Sommer · 20
Dussaud · 109

E

Ebeling · 23
Eichrodt · 93
Eisler · 16, 78
Eissfeldt · 8–10, 37f, 42,
58, 60, 68
Emerton · 10–13, 29, 32,
36–38, 42, 58f, 66f, 70,
92, 96, 101, 104, 109
Ewald · 103f

F

Farrer · 94, 101
Ferch · 13–15, 32, 60, 70f,
92
Feuillet · 89, 91, 93, 98f,
101, 104, 106
Fitzmyer · 19f
Fohrer · 10
Frank · 23

G

Gadd · 45f
von Gall · 18, 72f, 75, 107
Gese · 5, 36, 70, 76, 90,
100, 104f
Gibson · 12
Ginsberg · 63, 115

Glasson · 92
 Goettsberger · 28, 36, 39,
 41, 44, 108
 Goetze · 63
 Goldingay · 7, 12, 17, 20,
 22, 26, 29, 30, 36–42,
 54, 57, 67, 70, 76, 80–
 82, 87, 100, 102–106
 Goodenough · 51
 Gordon · 60
 Grapow · 47
 Grayson · 63, 86
 Grelot · 83
 Gressmann · 16, 42, 45,
 47–50, 55f, 72f, 75, 78–
 80, 107f, 116
 Grill · 77, 90
 Grønæk · 7
 Gunkel · 3–6, 9f, 14, 29f,
 32f, 36–38, 42, 55f

H

Haag · 34–42, 54, 66, 82,
 97, 98, 102–105
 Halperin · 99f, 102, 104f
 Hammer · 7, 36–41, 61, 96,
 102–105
 Hartman/Di Lella · 14, 19,
 31f, 36–38, 40, 45, 92,
 102–105, 107
 Heaton · 6, 29, 36, 37–44,
 56, 92, 95, 102–106
 Heidel · 7, 23
 van Henten · 9, 19
 Herder · 42
 Herdner · 111
 Hertlein · 92
 Herzfeld · 43, 83, 107, 109f
 Hill · 52, 109
 Hilzheimer · 46
 Hitzig · 43f
 Hölscher · 4, 6, 36, 41f
 Hommel · 56f
 Hooker · 30, 37f, 92, 101
 Huehnergard · 65
 Hutter · 62

I

Iber · 74
 Imhoof-Blumer · 50

J

Jack · 58
 Jacobsen · 62
 Jansen · 56f, 76, 78, 80
 Jastrow · 42, 44, 47, 48
 Jeffery · 6, 10, 36–42, 44,
 48, 50, 58, 74, 82, 102–
 106, 109
 Jenkins · 53f
 Jeremias · 42, 45, 55f, 78
 Jirku · 60
 Junker · 6f, 30f, 36–42, 44–
 49, 57, 66, 76f, 79, 82,
 104–107

K

Kalthoff · 79
 Kapelrud · 5, 10, 59
 Kearns · 9, 12, 14, 37f, 56,
 60, 62, 63–66, 68–73,
 77, 79, 81–83, 88, 90f,
 94, 102–106, 108–110,
 117
 Keel · 54, 79
 Keil · 28, 37, 40f, 43f, 102–
 104, 106, 123
 Kittel · 58, 125
 Kloos · 7
 Koch · 6, 8f, 36f, 43f, 50,
 57, 70, 76, 81, 88, 100
 Koenen · 19
 Kraeling C.H. · 5, 14, 42,
 57, 72, 75, 100
 Kraeling E.G.H. · 5, 19, 44,
 47, 56, 75
 Kratz · 36
 Kristensen · 56
 Kruse · 91, 100
 Kuhn · 92
 Kvanvig · 7, 13–15, 22–27,
 29f, 32, 36–39, 57, 65,
 70f, 84–86, 88, 99, 101,
 103, 105f

L

Lacocque · 7, 12, 14, 17,
 29, 36–42, 61, 76, 82,
 96, 102–106, 124
 Lambert · 3, 62

Lange · 49f, 53
 Layard · 44, 46
 Lebram · 19, 36, 106f
 von Lengerke · 43, 46, 88
 Leupold · 28, 37, 39–41,
 44, 102, 104–106
 Lindars · 92
 Longenecker · 92
 Lucas · 7, 16, 18, 20, 22,
 26, 28, 31f, 36, 39–41,
 54, 86f

M

Maier · 44
 Marti · 4, 18, 29, 36–41,
 43, 103–105, 127
 McCown · 19
 Meissner · 48
 Meyer · 4–6, 10, 18, 42f,
 45, 74f, 92, 107, 127
 Montgomery · 6, 28, 37–
 44, 46–49, 58, 92, 102–
 107
 Morenz · 41, 49–52, 54
 de Morgan · 48, 129
 Morgenstern · 79–81
 Mosca · 14, 17, 31, 33, 35–
 38, 41f, 69, 92, 96f,
 101–103, 105f
 Mowinckel · 72–74, 89
 Muilenburg · 57f, 93, 101f
 Müller · 61, 76, 91f, 101,
 129
 Münter · 43, 46

N

Naville · 48
 Newberry · 48
 Newell · 53
 Noth · 11, 36, 42, 44–50

O

O'Callaghan · 46
 Oden · 70
 Oesterley · 88
 Oldenburg · 60
 Oppenheim · 46, 49, 86
 Otto · 74, 76, 78, 119

P

Parrot · 49
 Perrot/Chipiez · 45f
 Pfeleiderer · 77
 Philo of Alexandria · 95
 Philo of Byblos · 63, 68
 Plöger · 7, 14, 31, 36f, 41,
 44, 102–106
 Pope · 60
 Porteous · 7, 29, 36–42, 44,
 92, 96, 102–105
 Porter · 7, 14, 18, 20–22,
 36, 38f, 41f, 49, 54, 86,
 92, 105f
 Prinz · 107
 Pritchard · 44–48, 50, 83,
 108f, 116, 120f, 126,
 128, 130
 Procksch · 95, 102

R

von Rad · 38
 Reid · 5, 8, 19, 31, 67, 107
 Reifenberg · 52
 Reitzenstein · 57, 72
 Rhodes · 6, 11, 29, 36–42,
 44, 46, 48, 101–106
 Richter · 71
 Rimbach · 20
 Root · 43
 Rost · 11, 59f, 105
 Rowland · 93, 99
 Russell · 92, 99
 Rutten · 45

S

Sahlin · 99
 Sarre · 42, 44, 107
 Schaeffer · 108
 Schmidt E.F. · 109
 Schmidt J.M. · 71, 88
 Schmidt N. · 55, 77, 90
 Schmidt S.R. · 100
 Schmidt W. · 60
 Schrader · 4, 18, 44, 55
 Sellin · 75, 88f
 Shea · 62
 Smith J.P. · 82
 Smith M.S. · 7
 Smith R. · 18
 von Soden · 23
 Speiser · 23f, 63, 86
 Staerk · 74
 Staub · 7, 14, 16, 18, 45,
 49–54, 79
 Staubli · 50, 54
 Steinmann · 10, 16, 36, 41,
 43f, 49, 94, 104
 Stier · 76, 91, 95, 100, 105f
 Strack/Billerbeck · 88

T

Tengström · 36
 Toscanne · 46
 Towner · 36, 39–41, 44, 54,
 102f, 105
 Tsumura · 7, 62f

U

Uehlinger · 44, 47
 Ungnad · 46

V

Vanel · 109f
 Virolleaud · 60
 Völter · 18, 74
 Volz · 5, 94, 129

W

Weber · 45, 47f
 Welch · 88
 Welles · 49
 Welten · 108
 West · 16, 73
 Westermann · 7
 Widengren · 72f
 Wiedemann · 48
 Wifall · 90
 Wilson · 19, 63
 Winckler · 4, 18, 55, 128
 Wittstruck · 19f
 Wolf · 31
 Woolley · 45f

Y

Young · 7, 36–44, 88, 102–
 106

Z

Zevit · 17, 37, 41, 83, 102–
 105
 Zimmern · 4, 18, 57, 80

Index of subjects

>

ʾab šnm · 58–60, 66f, 70

A

Achaemenid
 art · 43
 period · 75
 relief · 107
 Adam · 56, 59f, 71, 76, 94f, 101
 Adam Kadmon · 71
 Adapa · 56f
 aged god · 58f, 61, 66, 69, 78; cf. also decrepit person
 aged man · 82
 Ahuramazda · 74f, 107
 Akhenaten · 48
 Alexander III the Great · 49f, 53
 Alexandria · 52
 Amarna letters · 63
 Amenophis II · 47f
 Amesha Spentas · 74
 Amorites · 62
 Anani · 78
 Anat · 10f, 59, 62
 Ancient of days · 4, 15, 32, 55f, 58–61, 65–71, 75, 78–83, 85–87, 91, 93–95, 100f, 103, 107–109; cf. also *ʾab šnm*, decrepit person
 Angel of the Lord · 91
 angelic
 being · 32, 66, 90–92, 100
 son of man · 74
 ant · 20
 Anthropos · 72, 74, 78
 Antiochus I Nicator · 50
 Antiochus I Soter · 50f
 Antiochus III the Great · 53
 Antiochus IV Epiphanes · 9, 19, 49–52, 78
 Anzu–bird · 23f, 26f, 86
 Aphraates, homilies of · 82

apocalyptic · 12, 14, 19, 60, 63–66, 68, 72, 76, 81–83, 91, 93
 apocryphal parallels · 3f, 20, 22, 28f, 35, 53, 56, 66, 75f, 79, 82f, 87–89, 91f, 101f
 Apollodor · 8, 10
 Apollodorian library · 8
 apotheosis · 56, 93
 Aqhat, legend of · 83
 Aramaic · 82, 86f
 Aries · 15
 Armenia · 17
 Arslan Tash · 82f
 Artaxerxes I · 43, 109
 Artaxerxes II · 107
 Artaxerxes III · 107
 Asherah · 66
 Assur · 107
 Assyria · 18
 Assyrian iconography · 43–45
 Astarte · 63, 70
 astral
 geography · 15–17
 mysticism · 78
 astrological influence · 15–17, 78f
 Atrahasis · 57f
 Atum · 79f
 aureole · 83, 108
 Avaris · 63
 Avesta · 73
 Azi Dahaka · 18

B

Baal · 7–11, 13, 30, 33, 56, 58–71, 82f, 96f, 107, 109, 119–121, 123, 128
 Baal Shamem · 70, 81
 Baal Zaphon · 8–10
 Baalhammon · 108
 Babylon · 16f, 29, 42f, 56, 62, 72, 75f, 78, 99
 Babylonian
 art · 6, 22, 42
 cosmogony · 10, 68
 garb · 19

iconography · 43–49
 influence · 3–7, 10, 16, 19, 55–57, 75, 78, 88, 107
 mythology · 11, 18, 29, 43, 92
 seal · 42
 syncretism · 75f
 thought · 77
 tradition · 16
 Babylonian–Assyrian
 iconography · 44, 49
 banquet · 24
 bark · 79
 bear · 4, 16f, 19–21, 26–28, 31, 34, 39, 45–47, 54, 102
 beard · 60, 107f
 beast · 3–16, 17–22, 26–34, 36–44, 48–51, 53–57, 59, 69, 75, 78, 85–87, 91f, 94, 96, 98–102
 bee · 20
 Beersheba · 82
 Bel · 5, 46
 Belet–Šeri · 85
 Bes · 28, 46
 bird · 21, 23f, 26f, 86
 bird of prey · 43
 birth omen influence · 20, 22
 Book of Destiny · 78
 Book of the Dead · 109
 Brahamism · 77
 Buddha · 77
 bull · 43–46, 49, 54, 78
 horn · 49–51, 53
 Bundahishn · 72f
 Byblos · 63, 68, 83

C

Canaanite influence · 6f, 9–13, 27, 58–70, 92
 Cancer · 17
 cap · 50f, 53, 108
 Capricorn · 15
 Carchemish · 47
 cat · 17

celestial
 being · 100
 spirits · 91
 struggle · 92
 Chaldea · 18
 chaos · 4f, 8, 11–14, 17,
 28f, 31–33, 59, 89, 95,
 97
 animal · 9
 beast · 4
 dragon · 11, 29, 32, 59
 monster · 12
 myth · 4
 powers of · 69, 97, 98
 sea · 5
 symbol · 13f
 chariot · 107f, 110
 cherub · 43
 circle of gods · 83; cf. also
 council of gods
 cloud · 3, 11f, 21, 32, 34,
 55f, 59, 64, 66–70, 78,
 86, 90, 93, 97–100, 106,
 109, 110
 coin · 44, 48, 49–54, 109
 combat · 57
 myth · 8, 14
 cornucopia · 51f; cf. also
 horns of plenty
 cosmogony · 4f
 cosmological being · 74
 cosmology · 7, 62
 council of gods · 56, 58, 62,
 65, 67, 69f, 82f, 87, 96,
 108; cf. also circle of
 gods
 cow · 21
 creation epic · 29, 33, 56,
 62
 creation myth · 3–5, 7
 crown · 26, 27, 50
 cylinder seal · 43, 45f, 48
 Cyprus · 108

D

Darius · 43
 seal of · 43
 Darius I · 42f
 David · 78, 90, 96f, 102
 decrepit person · 82; cf.
 also aged god
 Deir el Bahari · 48
 Demetrius I, Soter · 51
 Demetrius Poliorketes · 49
 demon · 19, 43, 45, 48

Demotic Chronicle · 19
 divine
 attribute · 100
 being · 57, 65f, 68, 100
 conflict · 66f
 enemy · 12
 figure · 59, 70, 86, 109
 glory · 93
 judgement · 69
 presence · 89
 sphere · 101
 Wisdom · 89
 dog · 17
 dragon · 6, 8–13, 17, 29,
 32, 36, 42, 56, 59, 61,
 66f

E

Ea · 55
 eagle · 4, 16, 21, 38, 43, 99
 Ea–Oannes · 56f
 Ebla · 62
 Ecbatana · 52f
 Egypt · 19, 47
 Egyptian
 god · 19, 79f
 iconography · 48, 107
 influence · 19, 79f, 107
 El · 7, 58–62, 65–71, 81–
 83, 96f, 107f
 Elam · 44
 Elamite iconography · 47
 elephant · 51, 53f
 Elohim · 65
 Elyon · 59, 66, 68, 96
 Endzeit · 3, 29, 72, 76, 94
 Enkidu · 24–26, 84–86
 enthroned · 61, 82f, 85,
 101, 104, 108f
 enthronement · 30, 55f, 59,
 61, 67f, 70, 75, 84, 89,
 92, 94–96
 festival · 58, 66f, 87, 89,
 95f, 101f
 Enuma Elish · 3–7, 12f, 31,
 33, 55–57, 62f, 66
 equinoctial New Year's
 Day festival · 81
 Ereshkigal · 24, 84f
 eschatological
 Adam · 94
 being · 74
 function · 57
 functions · 73
 judgment · 57

Messiah · 89
 saviour · 89, 94
 son of man · 73
 eschatology · 3, 56f, 63, 66,
 73f, 76f, 88–90, 93f,
 96f, 101

F

Father of
 Mortals · 60
 Sunem · 60
 the Exalted Ones · 60
 the Luminaires · 60
 years · 58, 61, 67, 70
 Years · 60
 fiery weapon · 109
 fire · 4, 12, 32, 55, 75, 77f,
 82–85, 94, 98f, 101,
 104f, 108f
 stream of · 55, 75, 77f,
 82, 101
 streams of · 83
 First Man · 73
 four winds · 3–7, 34, 36,
 42, 86, 99
 Fravashi · 74, 76

G

Gaya · 72
 Gayomart · 72f, 75–77
 Gilgamesh · 24, 86
 Gnosticism · 60, 71, 75f
 Great Bear · 16
 Greek
 divination · 22
 empire · 3, 8, 15f, 18, 54
 god · 8, 19
 influence · 8f, 79
 myth · 63
 grey hair · 59, 61
 griffin · 42–44
 guardian angel · 66, 90, 92
 Gudea · 48

H

Hadad · 12, 62–65, 69f,
 81–83, 109
 hair · 21, 25, 59–61, 66f,
 82, 87, 103, 108

Hall of a Hundred Columns
· 43, 109f
Haremhab · 48
Hasmoneans · 51
he-goat · 9, 15, 18, 46, 98
Hellenistic
 empire · 51
 iconography · 107
 king · 51f
 kings · 54
 myth · 72
 period · 68, 81, 83
Hermetic books · 15
Hinduism · 77
hippocamp · 109
Hittite
 iconography · 44, 47f
 influence · 5
 mythology · 43
homo · 66
horn · 4, 13, 21, 26, 31, 41,
 43, 47–54, 96, 108
horned
 animal · 20, 53
 beast · 50
 cap · 49f
 crown · 26, 50
 headgear · 49
 Hellenistic ruler · 52
 horse · 51
horns of plenty · 51; cf.
 also cornucopia
horse · 51
Horus · 79f
Horus Behedti · 80
human · 3, 20f, 26f, 43–45,
 48, 57, 72f, 81, 86, 90,
 97, 99, 101
 head · 43–45
Humbaba · 24
hypostatisation · 91, 101

I

iconographic influence ·
 10f, 22, 27, 34, 42, 54,
 63, 69, 82, 107, 110
Indian influence · 74, 77
inscription · 19f, 63, 69,
 82f
Iran · 52
Iranian influence · 16, 18f,
 56, 71, 76, 78, 88
Itu · 61

J

Jebusites · 96
Jeremias · 42, 45, 55f, 78
Jerusalem · 66, 68, 90
Jesus ben Sirach · 82
John Hyrcanus · 52
Judah · 81, 97
Judge River · 59
judgement · 1, 5, 8, 18, 23f,
 32, 55, 57f, 69f, 75f,
 79f, 85, 90, 95, 99, 105
judicial
 assembly · 69
 function · 57, 59, 77
 role · 69, 76

K

Karatepe inscription · 83
king · 8, 11, 13f, 18–23,
 48–51, 54, 56–58, 60–
 62, 64f, 70, 73, 78, 81,
 84–86, 89, 93, 95–98,
 101, 109f
Kingu · 55
Krishna · 77
Kudurru · 46f
Kuyuncik · 24

L

Labbu · 5
Lagidic coin · 51f
Lebanon · 23
Leo · 16–18
leopard · 4, 17, 19–21, 26–
 28, 31, 34, 40, 47f, 54,
 102
Leviathan · 3, 7, 10–14, 29,
 32
lightning · 84, 86, 109
lion · 4, 6, 16f, 19–21, 25–
 27, 31, 34, 38, 42–45,
 48, 54, 99
 monster · 43
locusts · 27
Logos · 71
louse · 20
Löwengreif · 42–44
ltn · 8–14
LXX · 59, 91
lyre · 45f, 70
Lysimachus · 49f

M

Macedonia · 52
Macedonian
 coin · 49, 51
 empire · 3
 representations · 49
 ruler · 50
Mahapursha · 77
Mandatar · 94, 101
Mazaeus · 44
Media · 16f, 54
Melammu · 64
Melcarth · 81
Mesopotamia · 17
Mesopotamian
 art · 27, 44
 background · 44, 50
 mythology · 13, 86
 omen literature · 22
 text · 25
 tradition · 62
Messiah · 57, 72, 74, 77,
 88–91, 95, 100
Messianic
 aspect · 56
 background · 91
 eschatological outlook ·
 93
 expectations · 95
 function · 101
 hope · 100
 king · 78
 kingdom · 91, 98
 son of man · 57
 thought · 101
Metatron · 91
Micaiah ben Imlah · 82
Michael · 55, 66, 90f, 100
Midrash · 78
milky way · 78
Mischgestalt · 57
Mischwesen · 5, 22, 27, 32,
 42–44, 99, 110
Mithras · 75
Mons Casius · 8
monster · 12, 25–27, 29,
 35, 42f, 62
moon-god · 107f
Mot · 70, 82
moth · 20
mountain · 8, 65, 98
mysticism · 78

N

Nārāyaṇa · 77
 Nablus · 108
 Neb · 78
 Nebo · 78
 Nebuchadnezzar · 27, 98
 Nergal · 23, 84, 86f
 New Year's Festival · 56,
 87, 89
 nimbus · 108
 Nimrud · 43
 Nineveh · 46

O

Old Testament influence ·
 28–42, 87–107
 omen literature · 20–22
 Oracle of the Potter · 19, 68
 Osiris · 80

P

pantheon · 62
 panther · 16, 31, 47f
 paranatellonta · 16
 Pazuzu · 45
 Pegasus · 16
 Pergamon · 52
 Persepolis · 42f, 50, 52f,
 107, 109f
 Perseus · 78
 Perseus–Andromeda saga ·
 63
 Persia · 9, 15–17, 42, 52,
 54, 76
 Persian
 cylinder seal · 45f
 demons · 19
 iconography · 10, 43,
 45f
 influence · 5, 16, 18f,
 56, 71–76, 78, 88
 Phoenicia · 81
 Phoenician
 beliefs · 81
 History by Philo of
 Byblos · 63, 68
 influence · 18
 site of Arslan Tash · 82
 wind kolphia · 4
pKil 31c4 · 65
 plagiarism · 3

Platonic ideas · 79
 Poimandres · 72
 Primal Man · 101
 Primordial Man · 71f, 74,
 76
 Prince Sea · 10
 prophecy · 3, 19
 Prophecy of Nefer-rohu ·
 19
 Pseudo-Clementine
 writings · 95
 Ptolemaic
 coin · 49
 rule · 52
 Ptolemaic coin · 51
 Ptolemies · 49
 Ptolemy I Soter · 49, 51, 53
 Punic · 82, 108
Purusha · 77f

Q

Qumran · 59

R

rabbinism · 88
 Rahab · 3, 29, 32, 96
 ram · 9, 15, 18, 54, 98
 horn · 49–51
 rampant posture · 45–47
 Ramses III · 47
 Ras Shamra · 5, 8, 10, 76
 Re · 46, 80
 Re–Harachte · 80
 relief · 42f, 47, 109
 Rider of the Clouds · 60f,
 64, 66f, 69, 109
 Rigveda · 73, 77
 royal
 cult in Jerusalem · 68
 Egyptian tombs · 48
 hero · 43
 myths · 90

S

salvation history · 34
 Saoshyant · 73f, 76
 Sargon · 49
 satrap · 44
Schlangengreif · 49
 scorpion · 19, 20, 43

sea · 3–7, 10–14, 16, 19,
 25–27, 29–37, 42, 56,
 59, 62, 65f, 69, 75, 96f,
 99f, 109
 dragon · 11
 monster · 11, 30, 35, 66,
 69
 seated · 23, 84, 99, 109
 Sefire inscription · 19f
 Seleucid
 coin · 50–52
 empire · 8
 king · 8, 48–51
 kingdom · 8f
 Seleucids · 49, 51, 53f
 Seleucus I Nicator · 50f, 53
seleukidisches Eigengut ·
 49, 51
 serpent · 13, 19f
 Seth · 9, 19, 63
 Shamash · 75
 shepherd · 22f, 85f
 Shishak list · 82
 Shumma Izbu · 20f
 Sin · 107f
 sitting · 108
 solar god · 81
 Solomon · 81
 son of man · 3f, 10–12, 14f,
 21f, 32, 34, 55–61, 65–
 82, 85–97, 99–102,
 107–110
 spear · 109
 sphinx · 44, 47
 Sraosha · 74
 star · 16
 stela · 63, 69, 83, 109
 storm god · 66, 69, 96, 109f
 Story of Astarte · 63
 Sumer · 47, 62
 Sumerian lament · 68
 Sumerian mythology · 6
 sun · 73
 cycle of · 79, 107
 disk · 79, 83, 108f
 god · 73, 75, 79f, 107
 midday · 80
 phases of · 79
 reciprocal phases of · 80
 rising · 79f
 setting · 79f
 Susa · 43, 53
 sword · 23
 Syria · 8f, 15, 18, 62, 81
 Syriac · 82
 Syrian · 15
 Syrian king · 48
 Syro-Palestine · 42

Syro-Palestinian influence · 81–83

T

Tablets of Destiny · 55f, 78
 Tammuz · 57
 Targum · 78
 Taurus · 78
tehom · 6f
 Tell
 Brak · 46
 el-Amarna · 48
 Halaf · 46
 temple · 48f, 51, 67, 69, 82
 Teshub · 63
 Teucer · 17f, 78
 theophany · 68, 77, 93
 Thot · 80
 Thrace · 52
 throne · 23f, 32, 55f, 69,
 78, 84, 93, 97–100,
 108–110, 116
Thronwagen · 108
 Thutmose III · 47f
 Thutmose IV · 48
 Tiamat · 6f, 29, 42, 55, 62
 Treaty curse imagery
 influence · 19
 tree · 47, 98, 109
 Typhon · 8–10, 19, 63, 107
 Tyre, religion of · 80
 Tyrian
 iconography · 109
 influence · 79–81

U

Ugarit · 5, 8, 14, 32, 58,
 61f, 65, 71, 83, 108
 Ugaritic
 Baal cycle · 56

chaos sea · 5
 combat myth · 7
 dragon · 8
 iconography · 83, 108f
 mythology · 11
 relief · 108f
 statuette · 109
 stela · 83, 109
 text · 5, 7, 9f, 12, 14f,
 33, 58–60, 64, 67–
 70, 83

Ugartic

text · 58

Ullikummi

myth of · 63

song of · 63, 66

Ur · 44–46

Uradam · 94

uranography · 78

Urmensch · 56, 71–74, 76–
 78, 88f, 94, 101

Uruk · 68

Urzeit · 3, 29, 72, 76, 94

V

vernal equinox · 81

Virgo · 18

Vishnu · 77

Vision of the Netherworld,
 influence of the · 23–26,
 84–86

Vivahvant · 73

vizier · 91

Völkerarchonten · 92

W

warrior god · 23

weapon · 12, 21

wheel · 32, 83, 84, 99, 105,
 109

white hair · 59, 66f, 82, 87,
 103

wind · 11

wing · 16, 21, 26f, 38, 40,
 43, 45, 47f, 98f

winged

animal · 22, 45, 47

beast · 48

bull · 44

creature · 47

demon · 45

human · 43, 48

lion · 16, 42–44, 48, 54

Mischwesen · 45

monster · 26, 43

sphinx · 44

Wisdom literature · 89

Y

Yahweh · 29, 59–61, 63,
 65–68, 70, 81, 89, 93f,
 96–98, 100

Yahweh, angel of · 91

Yam · 10–13, 25, 30, 33,
 59, 61–63, 65f, 70, 96

Yama · 73, 76

Yehud coin · 109

Yima · 73, 76

Z

Zaphon · 8–10, 96

Zeus · 8, 63, 67, 79, 107

Zeus Casios · 8

Zion · 97f

Zodiac signs · 15–18, 46,
 78

Zoroastrian

influence · 76

judgement · 75

Index of biblical references

Genesis

1 · 5, 7, 34, 56
 1:2 · 6, 34, 36
 1:26 · 94, 101
 1:26–28 · 89
 1:27 · 95
 1:28 · 101
 1:6 · 34
 1:7 · 34
 1:9 · 34
 6:13 · 34
 7:11 · 6, 34, 37
 15:17 · 104
 21:33 · 82
 39 · 98

Exodus

3:2 · 104
 19:16 · 106
 19:18 · 104
 20:18 · 104
 32:32f · 105

Leviticus

11 · 28

Numbers

16:35 · 104

Deuteronomy

4:24 · 104
 9:3 · 104
 14 · 28
 32:8 · 66, 83, 91
 32:8f · 59, 92
 33:2 · 102, 104
 33:2f · 83
 33:17 · 41
 33:26 · 64, 106
 33:27 · 82

Joshua

7:25 · 106

1 Samuel

17:34–37 · 38f
 21:1, 10 · 41

2 Samuel

22:11 · 64

1 Kings

8:10f · 106
 22:19 · 82f, 91, 102

2 Kings

2:24 · 39

Esther

6:1 · 105

Job

1:6 · 83, 103
 1:6ff · 91
 2:1 · 83, 91, 103
 5:1 · 83
 7:12 · 37
 9:13 · 37
 15:8 · 83, 103
 15:14–16 · 92
 25:4–6 · 92
 26:7 · 13
 26:12 · 13
 26:13 · 13
 36:26 · 103

38:8 · 37
 41:1 · 37

Psalms

2 · 29, 36, 89f, 95f, 101
 2:5 · 101
 4 · 36
 8 · 34f, 92, 95
 8:2 · 97
 8:3 · 97
 8:4 · 92
 8:5 · 93
 8:7–10 · 92
 9:4 · 103
 12:3f · 41
 18:3 · 41
 18:9–12 · 106
 18:9–14 · 104
 18:11 · 64
 20 · 96
 21 · 96
 29 · 12
 29:1 · 83, 103
 29:7 · 12
 29:10 · 65
 46:2f · 37
 46:3f · 97
 46:4 · 34
 50 · 103
 50:3 · 104
 51:7 · 103
 55:19 · 103
 56:8 · 105
 68:5 · 64
 68:17 · 103
 68:30 · 37
 68:31 · 3
 68:33 · 64
 68:33f · 64
 68:35 · 64
 69:28 · 105
 72 · 96
 74 · 3, 29
 74:13f · 97, 105
 74:13–17 · 13, 37
 74:13ff · 29
 75:4–6, 10 · 41
 80 · 92, 100
 80:13 · 38

80:17 · 90, 92f
 82:1 · 65, 83, 103
 82:6 · 83
 84:8f · 90
 87:4 · 3, 38
 89 · 29, 34f, 96f
 89:3 · 96
 89:4 · 97
 89:5, 7 · 97
 89:5–7 · 96
 89:6f · 103
 89:6, 8 · 83
 89:6–8 · 96
 89:6–9 · 96
 89:7 · 83
 89:9 · 96
 89:9f · 97
 89:9–11 · 13, 38, 105
 89:9f · 29
 89:10 · 96f
 89:10f · 96
 89:12f · 96
 89:14 · 96
 89:17 · 96
 89:19 · 97
 89:19–27 · 96
 89:20 · 96
 89:23 · 97
 89:25 · 96f
 89:26 · 96
 89:27 · 97
 89:28f · 97
 89:36f · 97
 89:37 · 97
 90:2 · 103
 93 · 64
 93:1 · 64
 93:1a · 65
 93:1–4 · 65
 93:2 · 65
 93:3 · 65
 93:3f · 34, 37, 97
 93:4 · 65
 93:13 · 103, 105
 97:2–4 · 104, 106
 97:7 · 83
 101 · 96
 101:5 · 41
 102:24–27 · 103
 104:3 · 64, 106
 104:25f · 38
 110 · 96
 110:1 · 90
 122:5 · 103
 132 · 96
 139:16 · 105
 145:13 · 64
 148:2 · 83

Proverbs

1–9 · 89
 9 · 89
 17:12 · 40
 28:15 · 38, 40

Isaiah

1:18 · 103
 2:11 · 41
 4:3 · 105
 5:15 · 41
 5:26–29 · 35, 97
 5:30 · 34
 6 · 93
 6:1 · 82, 103f
 6:1f, 8 · 103
 6:2 · 83
 8:7f · 35, 97
 9:5 · 91
 10 · 34f, 98
 10:5f · 35, 97
 10:7–11 · 34
 10:7–12 · 41
 11:6f · 38, 40
 13:17 · 34
 13:17f · 40
 14 · 35, 98
 14:4–23 · 42
 17:12–14 · 13, 34, 37
 18:19 · 34
 19:1 · 64, 106
 21:2 · 34, 40
 27:1 · 3, 13, 29, 38, 106
 28:15 · 35, 97
 30:7 · 3, 29
 30:33 · 106
 31:8 · 29
 37:23 · 42
 37:36 · 29
 40:28 · 82
 41:2f · 34, 40
 41:4 · 103
 43:19 · 29
 44:6 · 103
 45:1–7 · 34
 46:11 · 34
 50:2f · 29
 51:9f · 13, 106
 51:9, 11 · 38
 51:9–11 · 29
 51:10 · 6, 37
 51:11 · 40
 51:28 · 40
 65:6 · 105

Jeremiah

1:15 · 35, 97
 1:22 · 97
 4:6 · 35, 97
 4:6f · 34, 39
 5:6 · 19, 39f
 6:1 · 35, 97
 6:22 · 35
 6:23 · 34, 37
 15:3 · 19
 17:1 · 105
 23:18 · 83, 105
 23:22 · 105
 25:9 · 35, 97
 27 · 35, 97
 38:40 · 34
 46:7f · 37
 49:19–22 · 39
 49:20 · 34
 49:36 · 34
 50:17 · 34, 39
 51:11 · 34
 51:25f · 34
 51:28 · 34
 51:41 · 34

Lamentations

3:10 · 39f
 4:19 · 39

Ezekiel

1 · 41, 86f, 89, 92–94, 98f,
 101, 107
 1:1 · 98f
 1:4 · 93, 98f, 104, 106
 1:5 · 98f
 1:6 · 99
 1:6–11 · 98
 1:7 · 16
 1:8 · 99
 1:10 · 39, 99
 1:13 · 104
 1:13f · 98
 1:15f · 99
 1:15–21 · 99
 1:15–28 · 98, 105
 1:22f · 99
 1:26 · 82, 93, 99–101, 103f
 1:26–28 · 99
 1:27 · 99, 104
 1:29 · 98

3:23 · 98
 8:2 · 94, 98
 8:3 · 98
 8:4 · 98
 8–11 · 94, 101
 8:15 · 98
 8:28 · 98
 9:1–11 · 94
 9:2f · 98
 9:11 ·
 10:1f, 7 · 104
 10:2 · 98, 105
 10:2, 6f · 94
 10:6f · 98
 10:7 · 98
 11:13 · 98
 12:27 · 98
 17:3 · 34, 39, 98
 17:3–15 · 34
 17:22f · 98
 19:1–9 · 98
 20:6 · 98
 20:15 · 98
 21:30–34 · 98
 26:2 · 98
 26:7 · 98
 27:2 · 98
 27:15 · 53
 28:2–10 · 42
 28:3 · 98
 29 · 3, 29
 29:3 · 38, 42
 29:3–5 · 98
 29:18 · 34
 32 · 3, 29
 32:2–6 · 98
 32:2–8 · 38
 34:17 · 98
 35:5 · 98
 37:9 · 34
 38 · 35, 38, 98
 38:4 · 98
 39 · 35, 38
 39:6 · 106
 39:18 · 98
 40:1ff · 94
 40:3 · 98
 41:21 · 98
 42:11 · 98
 43:1ff · 94
 43:3 · 98
 43:6 · 94
 44:1, 4 · 94
 44:3 · 98
 46:19 · 94
 47:1, 8ff · 94

Daniel

2 · 13, 36
 2:32, 37f · 39
 2:32, 39 · 40
 2:35 · 98
 2:37 · 98
 2:37f · 106
 2:39 · 41
 2:40 · 41
 2:44 · 106
 3 · 27
 3:4 · 106
 3:33 · 64, 106
 4 · 27, 36, 39, 64
 4:3 · 64, 106
 4:5–25 · 98
 4:9 · 98
 4:31 · 64, 106
 5 · 36
 5:18f · 106
 6:26f · 106
 6:27 · 64
 8 · 9, 15f, 18, 21f, 36, 98
 8:2 · 98
 8:3–9 · 41
 8:8 · 36
 8:9 · 98
 8:15 · 91, 98
 8:17 · 98
 8:17ff · 98
 8:20f · 15
 8:20–25 · 41
 8:21 · 15, 18
 8:23 · 41
 8:26 · 98
 9:21 · 91
 10:5 · 91, 98
 10:5f · 15f
 10:9–11 · 98
 10:16 · 98
 10:18 · 91
 10:20f · 92
 10:21 · 105
 11:2f · 41
 11:4 · 36
 11:16 · 98
 11:21 · 41
 11:35–40 · 98
 11:36 · 42
 11:41 · 98
 12:1 · 105
 12:3 · 98
 12:4 · 98
 12:6 · 98
 12:8 · 98
 12:17 · 98

Hosea

13:5–6 · 54
 13:7 · 31
 13:7f · 11, 19, 31f, 34, 39–41

Amos

3:12 · 34
 3:12f · 40
 5:19 · 39f
 7:4 · 6, 37

Obadiah

12 · 42

Nahum

1:3 · 106

Habakkuk

1:8 · 34, 39, 41

Zechariah

2:1–4 · 38, 41
 2:6 · 36
 2:10 · 34
 6:5 · 34, 36
 12–14 · 35f, 98
 14:3–5 · 92
 14:5 · 103

Malachi

3:1 · 91
 3:16 · 105

Revelation

1:13–16 · 15
 12 · 8
 13 · 8
 17 · 8

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS – Lieferbare Titel

- Bd. 25/1a MICHAEL LATTKKE: *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. Band Ia. Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI. 68 Seiten. 1980.
- Bd. 25/2 MICHAEL LATTKKE: *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. Band II. Vollständige Wortkonkordanz zur handschriftlichen, griechischen, koptischen, lateinischen und syrischen Überlieferung der Oden Salomos. Mit einem Faksimile des Kodex N. XVI–201 Seiten. 1979.
- Bd. 25/3 MICHAEL LATTKKE: *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. Band III. XXXIV–478 Seiten. 1986.
- Bd. 25/4 MICHAEL LATTKKE: *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. Band IV. XII–284 Seiten. 1998.
- Bd. 46 ERIK HORNUNG: *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskub*. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Unter Mitarbeit von Andreas Brodbeck, Hermann Schlögl und Elisabeth Staehelin und mit einem Beitrag von Gerhard Fecht. XII–129 Seiten, 10 Abbildungen. 1991. Dritte Auflage.
- Bd. 50/1 DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY: *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. 1. Josué, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther. Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle, établi en coopération avec Alexander R. Hulst †, Norbert Lohfink, William D. McHardy, H. Peter Rüger, coéditeur, James A. Sanders, coéditeur. 812 pages. 1982.
- Bd. 50/2 DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY: *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. 2. Isaïe, Jérémie, Lamentations. Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle, établi en coopération avec Alexander R. Hulst †, Norbert Lohfink, William D. McHardy, H. Peter Rüger, coéditeur, James A. Sanders, coéditeur. 1112 pages. 1986.
- Bd. 50/3 DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY: *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. Tome 3. Ezéchiël, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes. Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance Biblique Universelle, établi en coopération avec Alexander R. Hulst †, Norbert Lohfink, William D. McHardy, H. Peter Rüger †, coéditeur, James A. Sanders, coéditeur. 1424 pages. 1992.
- Bd. 53 URS WINTER: *Frau und Göttin*. Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt. XVIII–928 Seiten, 520 Abbildungen. 1983. 2. Auflage 1987. Mit einem Nachwort zur 2. Auflage.
- Bd. 55 PETER FREI / KLAUS KOCH: *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich*. 352 Seiten, 17 Abbildungen. 1996. Zweite, bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage.
- Bd. 67 OTHMAR KEEL / SILVIA SCHROER: *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Band I. 115 Seiten, 103 Abbildungen. 1985.
- Bd. 71 HANS-PETER MATHYS: *Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst*. Untersuchungen zum alttestamentlichen Gebot der Nächstenliebe (Lev 19,18). XII–204 Seiten. 1986. 2. verbesserte Auflage 1990.

- Bd. 85 ECKART OTTO: *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch»*. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen. 220 Seiten. 1989.
- Bd. 86 ANDRZEJ NIWIŃSKI: *Studies on the Illustrated Theban Funerary Papyri of the 11th and 10th Centuries B.C.* 488 pages, 80 plates. 1989.
- Bd. 87 URSULA SEIDL: *Die babylonischen Kudurru-Reliefs*. Symbole mesopotamischer Gottheiten. 236 Seiten, 33 Tafeln und 2 Tabellen. 1989.
- Bd. 88 OTHMAR KEEL / HILDI KEEL-LEU / SILVIA SCHROER: *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Band II. 364 Seiten, 652 Abbildungen. 1989.
- Bd. 89 FRIEDRICH ABITZ: *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.* 202 Seiten, 39 Abbildungen. 1989.
- Bd. 90 JOSEPH HENNINGER SVD: *Arabica varia*. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes. 504 pages. 1989.
- Bd. 91 GEORG FISCHER: *Jahwe unser Gott*. Sprache, Aufbau und Erzähltechnik in der Berufung des Mose (Ex. 3–4). 276 Seiten. 1989.
- Bd. 92 MARK A. O'BRIEN: *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*. 340 pages. 1989.
- Bd. 93 WALTER BEYERLIN: *Reflexe der Amosvisionen im Jeremiabuch*. 120 Seiten. 1989.
- Bd. 94 ENZO CORTESE: *Josua 13–21*. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. 136 Seiten. 1990.
- Bd. 96 ANDRÉ WIESE: *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*. 264 Seiten mit zahlreichen Abbildungen im Text und 32 Tafeln. 1990.
- Bd. 97 WOLFGANG ZWICKEL: *Räucher kult und Räuchergeräte*. Exegetische und archäologische Studien zum Räucheropfer im Alten Testament. 372 Seiten. Mit zahlreichen Abbildungen im Text. 1990.
- Bd. 98 AARON SCHART: *Mose und Israel im Konflikt*. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüstenerzählungen. 296 Seiten. 1990.
- Bd. 99 THOMAS RÖMER: *Israels Väter*. Untersuchungen zur Väterthematik im Deuteronomium und in der deuteronomistischen Tradition. 664 Seiten. 1990.
- Bd. 100 OTHMAR KEEL / MENAKHEM SHUVAL / CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER: *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina / Israel* Band III. Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop. XIV–456 Seiten. Mit zahlreichen Abbildungen im Text und 22 Tafeln. 1990.
- Bd. 101 CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER: *Weltreich und «eine Rede»*. Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbau erzählung (Gen 11,1–9). XVI–654 Seiten. 1990.
- Bd. 103 ADRIAN SCHENKER: *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament*. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien. VIII–312 Seiten. 1991.
- Bd. 104 DANIEL BODI: *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra*. IV–332 pages. 1991.
- Bd. 105 YUICHI OSUMI: *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b–23,33*. XII–284 Seiten. 1991.
- Bd. 106 RUDOLF WERNER: *Kleine Einführung ins Hieroglyphen-Luwische*. XII–112 Seiten. 1991.
- Bd. 107 THOMAS STAUBLI: *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*. XII–408 Seiten. 145 Abb. und 3 Falttafeln. 1991.
- Bd. 108 MOSHÉ ANBAR: *Les tribus amurrites de Mari*. VIII–256 pages. 1991.

- Bd. 109 GÉRARD J. NORTON / STEPHEN PISANO (eds.): *Tradition of the Text*. Studies offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday. 336 pages. 1991.
- Bd. 110 HILDI KEEL-LEU: *Vorderasiatische Stempelsiegel*. Die Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. 180 Seiten. 24 Tafeln. 1991.
- Bd. 111 NORBERT LOHFINK: *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium*. Mit einer Stellungnahme von Thomas Römer. 152 Seiten. 1991.
- Bd. 113 CHARLES MAYSTRE: *Les grands prêtres de Ptah de Memphis*. XIV–474 pages, 2 planches. 1992.
- Bd. 114 THOMAS SCHNEIDER: *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*. 480 Seiten. 1992.
- Bd. 115 ECKHARD VON NORDHEIM: *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients*. Religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104. 240 Seiten. 1992.
- Bd. 116 DONALD M. MATTHEWS: *The Kassite Glyptic of Nippur*. 208 pages, 210 figures. 1992.
- Bd. 117 FIONA V. RICHARDS: *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*. XII–152 pages, 16 plates. 1992.
- Bd. 118 YOHANAN GOLDMAN: *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil*. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie. XIV–270 pages. 1992.
- Bd. 119 THOMAS M. KRAPF: *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit*. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernachlässigter Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion. XX–364 Seiten. 1992.
- Bd. 120 MIRIAM LICHTHEIM: *Maat in Egyptian Autobiographies and Related Studies*. 236 pages, 8 plates. 1992.
- Bd. 121 ULRICH HÜBNER: *Spiele und Spielzeug im antiken Palästina*. 256 Seiten. 58 Abbildungen. 1992.
- Bd. 122 OTHMAR KEEL: *Das Recht der Bilder, gesehen zu werden*. Drei Fallstudien zur Methode der Interpretation altorientalischer Bilder. 332 Seiten, 286 Abbildungen. 1992.
- Bd. 123 WOLFGANG ZWICKEL (Hrsg.): *Biblische Welten*. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag. 268 Seiten, 19 Abbildungen. 1993.
- Bd. 125 BENJAMIN SASS / CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER (eds.): *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals*. Proceedings of a symposium held in Fribourg on April 17–20, 1991. 368 pages, 532 illustrations. 1993.
- Bd. 126 RÜDIGER BARTELMUS / THOMAS KRÜGER / HELMUT UTZSCHNEIDER (Hrsg.): *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte*. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag. 418 Seiten. 1993.
- Bd. 127 ASKOLD I. IVANTCHIK: *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*. 336 pages. 1993.
- Bd. 128 JENS VOSS: *Die Menora*. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem. 124 Seiten. 1993.
- Bd. 129 BERND JANOWSKI / KLAUS KOCH / GERNOT WILHELM (Hrsg.): *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*. Internationales Symposium Hamburg 17.–21. März 1990. 572 Seiten. 1993.

- Bd. 130 NILI SHUPAK: *Where can Wisdom be found? The Sage's Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature*. XXXII–516 pages. 1993.
- Bd. 131 WALTER BURKERT / FRITZ STOLZ (Hrsg.): *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*. 134 Seiten. 1994.
- Bd. 132 HANS-PETER MATHYS: *Dichter und Beter*. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit. 392 Seiten. 1994.
- Bd. 133 REINHARD G. LEHMANN: *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit*. 472 Seiten, 13 Tafeln. 1994.
- Bd. 135 OTHMAR KEEL: *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I–IV. XII–340 Seiten mit Abbildungen, 24 Seiten Tafeln. 1994.
- Bd. 136 HERMANN-JOSEF STIPP: *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches*. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte. VII–196 Seiten. 1994.
- Bd. 137 PETER ESCHWEILER: *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten*. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegenständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches. X–380 Seiten, 28 Seiten Tafeln. 1994.
- Bd. 138 CHRISTIAN HERRMANN: *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Mit einem Ausblick auf ihre Rezeption durch das Alte Testament. XXIV–1000 Seiten, 70 Seiten Bildtafeln. 1994.
- Bd. 140 IZAK CORNELIUS: *The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba'al*. Late Bronze and Iron Age I Periods (c 1500–1000 BCE). XII–326 pages with illustrations, 56 plates. 1994.
- Bd. 141 JOACHIM FRIEDRICH QUACK: *Die Lehren des Ani*. Ein neuägyptischer Weisheitstext in seinem kulturellen Umfeld. X–344 Seiten, 2 Bildtafeln. 1994.
- Bd. 142 ORLY GOLDWASSER: *From Icon to Metaphor*. Studies in the Semiotics of the Hieroglyphs. X–194 pages. 1995.
- Bd. 143 KLAUS BIEBERSTEIN: *Josua-Jordan-Jericho*. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6. XII–494 Seiten. 1995.
- Bd. 144 CHRISTL MAIER: *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1–9*. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie. XII–304 Seiten. 1995.
- Bd. 145 HANS ULRICH STEYMANS: *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons*. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel. XII–436 Seiten. 1995.
- Bd. 146 FRIEDRICH ABITZ: *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltbüchern des Neuen Reiches*. VIII–228 Seiten. 1995.
- Bd. 147 GILLES ROULIN: *Le Livre de la Nuit. Une composition égyptienne de l'au-delà*. I^{re} partie: traduction et commentaire. XX–420 pages. II^e partie: copie synoptique. X–169 pages, 21 planches. 1996.
- Bd. 148 MANUEL BACHMANN: *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse*. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst. 88 Seiten mit 40 Abbildungen. 1996.
- Bd. 150 ELISABETH STAEHELIN / BERTRAND JAEGER (Hrsg.): *Ägypten-Bilder*. Akten des «Symposiums zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.–11. September 1993. 384 Seiten Text, 108 Seiten mit Abbildungen. 1997.

- Bd. 151 DAVID A. WARBURTON: *State and Economy in Ancient Egypt*. Fiscal Vocabulary of the New Kingdom. 392 pages. 1996.
- Bd. 152 FRANÇOIS ROSSIER SM: *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque*. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu. 408 pages. 1996.
- Bd. 153 REINHARD GREGOR KRATZ / THOMAS KRÜGER (Hrsg.): *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld*. Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck. 148 Seiten. 1997.
- Bd. 154 ERICH BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL: *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1–39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit. XIV–534 Seiten. 1997.
- Bd. 155 MIRIAM LICHTHEIM: *Moral Values in Ancient Egypt*. 136 pages. 1997.
- Bd. 156 ANDREAS WAGNER (Hrsg.): *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*. VIII–212 Seiten. 1997.
- Bd. 157 OLIVIER ARTUS: *Etudes sur le livre des Nombres*. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1–20,13. X–310 pages. 1997.
- Bd. 158 DIETER BÖHLER: *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras α und Esra-Nehemia*. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels. XIV–464 Seiten. 1997.
- Bd. 159 WOLFGANG OSWALD: *Israel am Gottesberg*. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19–24 und deren historischem Hintergrund. X–300 Seiten. 1998.
- Bd. 160/1 JOSEF BAUER / ROBERT K. ENGLUND / MANFRED KREBERNIK: *Mesopotamien: Späturuk-Zeit und Frühdynastische Zeit*. Annäherungen 1. Herausgegeben von Pascal Attinger und Markus Wäfler. 640 Seiten. 1998.
- Bd. 160/3 WALTHER SALLABERGER / AAGE WESTENHOLZ: *Mesopotamien: Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit*. Annäherungen 3. Herausgegeben von Pascal Attinger und Markus Wäfler. 424 Seiten. 1999.
- Bd. 161 MONIKA BERNETT / OTHMAR KEEL: *Mond, Stier und Kult am Stadttor*. Die Stele von Betsaida (et-Tell). 175 Seiten mit 121 Abbildungen. 1998.
- Bd. 162 ANGELIKA BERLEJUNG: *Die Theologie der Bilder*. Herstellung und Einweihung von Kultbildern in Mesopotamien und die alttestamentliche Bilderpolemik. 1998. XII–560 Seiten. 1998.
- Bd. 163 SOPHIA K. BIETENHARD: *Des Königs General*. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2–20; 1 Kön 1–2. 388 Seiten. 1998.
- Bd. 164 JOACHIM BRAUN: *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas*. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen. XII–372 Seiten, 288 Abbildungen. 1999.
- Bd. 165 SOPHIE LAFONT: *Femmes, Droit et Justice dans l'Antiquité orientale*. Contribution à l'étude du droit pénal au Proche-Orient ancien. XVI–576 pages. 1999.
- Bd. 166 ESTHER FLÜCKIGER-HAWKER: *Urnamma of Ur in Sumerian Literary Tradition*. XVIII–426 pages, 25 plates. 1999.

- Bd. 167 JUTTA BOLLWEG: *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen*. Im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit. 160 Seiten und 68 Seiten Abbildungen. 1999.
- Bd. 168 MARTIN ROSE: *Rien de nouveau*. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988–1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allisson. 648 pages. 1999.
- Bd. 169 MARTIN KLINGBEIL: *Yahweh Fighting from Heaven*. God as Warrior and as God of Heaven in the Hebrew Psalter and Ancient Near Eastern Iconography. XII–374 pages. 1999.
- Bd. 170 BERND ULRICH SCHIPPER: *Israel und Ägypten in der Königszeit*. Die kulturellen Kontakte von Salomo bis zum Fall Jerusalems. 344 Seiten und 24 Seiten Abbildungen. 1999.
- Bd. 171 JEAN-DANIEL MACCHI: *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*. 408 pages. 1999.
- Bd. 172 ADRIAN SCHENKER: *Recht und Kult im alten Testament*. Achtzehn Studien. 232 Seiten. 2000.
- Bd. 173 GABRIELE THEUER: *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24. XVI–658 Seiten und 11 Seiten Abbildungen. 2000.
- Bd. 174 CATHIE SPIESER: *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*. XII–304 et 108 pages d'illustrations. 2000.
- Bd. 175 CHRISTOPH UEHLINGER (ed.): *Images as media – Sources for the cultural history of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (1st millennium BCE)*. Proceedings of an international symposium held in Fribourg on November 25–29, 1997. XXXII–404 pp., 60 pls. 2000.
- Bd. 176 ALBERT DE PURY/THOMAS RÖMER (Hrsg.): *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids*. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen. 212 Seiten. 2000.
- Bd. 177 JÜRGE EGGELER: *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2–14*. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present. VIII–156 pages. 2000.

Weitere Informationen zur Reihe OBO: <http://www.unifr.ch/bif/obo/obo.html>

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS, SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

- Bd. 1 JACQUES BRIEND / JEAN-BAPTISTE HUMBERT (Ed.): *Tell Keisan (1971–1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*. 392 pages, 142 planches. 1980.
- Bd. 2 BERTRAND JAEGER: *Essai de classification et datation des scarabées Menkhéperre*. 455 pages avec 1007 illustrations, 26 planches avec 443 figures. 1982.
- Bd. 3 RAPHAEL GIVEON: *Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia from the Collections of the British Museum*. 202 pages, 457 figures. 1985.
- Bd. 4 SEYYARE EICHLER / MARKUS WÄFLER: *Tall al-Hamidiya 1*. Vorbericht 1984. 360 Seiten, 104 Tafeln, 4 Seiten Illustrationen, 4 Faltpäne, 1 vierfarbige Tafel. 1985.
- Bd. 5 CLAUDIA MÜLLER-WINKLER: *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette*. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk. 590 Seiten, 40 Tafeln. 1987.
- Bd. 6 SEYYARE EICHLER / MARKUS WÄFLER / DAVID WARBURTON: *Tall al-Hamidiya 2*. Symposium Recent Excavations in the Upper Khabur Region. 492 Seiten, 20 Seiten Illustrationen, 2 Faltpäne, 1 vierfarbige Tafel. 1990.
- Bd. 7 HERMANN A. SCHLÖGL / ANDREAS BRODBECK: *Ägyptische Totenfiguren aus öffentlichen und privaten Sammlungen der Schweiz*. 356 Seiten mit 1041 Photos. 1990.
- Bd. 8 DONALD M. MATTHEWS: *Principles of composition in Near Eastern glyptic of the later second millennium B.C.* 176 pages, 39 pages with drawings, 14 plates. 1990.
- Bd. 9 CLAUDE DOUMET: *Sceaux et cylindres orientaux: la collection Chiba*. Préface de Pierre Amiet. 220 pages, 24 pages d'illustrations. 1992.
- Bd. 10 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Einleitung. 376 Seiten mit 603 Abbildungen im Text. 1995.
- Bd. 11 BEATRICE TEISSIER: *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*. XII–224 pages with numerous illustrations, 5 plates. 1996.
- Bd. 12 ANDRÉ B. WIESE: *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette*. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie. XXII–366 Seiten mit 1426 Abbildungen. 1996.
- Bd. 13 OTHMAR KEEL: *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band I. Von Tell Abu Farāğ bis 'Atlit. VIII–808 Seiten mit 375 Phototafeln. 1997.
- Bd. 14 PIERRE AMIET / JACQUES BRIEND / LILIANE COURTOIS / JEAN-BERNARD DUMORTIER: *Tell el Far'ah*. Histoire, glyptique et céramologique. 100 pages. 1996.

- Bd. 15 DONALD M. MATTHEWS: *The Early Glyptic of Tell Brak*. Cylinder Seals of Third Millennium Syria. XIV–312 pages, 59 plates. 1997.
- Bd. 16 SHUA AMORAI-STARK: *Wolfe Family Collection of Near Eastern Prehistoric Stamp Seals*. 216 pages. 1998.
- Bd. 17 OLEG BERLEV / SVETLANA HODJASH: *Catalogue of the Monuments of Ancient Egypt*. From the Museums of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Bielorussia, Caucasus, Middle Asia and the Baltic States. XIV–336 pages, 208 plates. 1998.
- Bd. 18 ASTRID NUNN: *Der figürliche Motiuschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* 280 Seiten und 92 Seiten Illustrationen. 2000.
- Bd. 19 ANDREA M. BIGNASCA: *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente*. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche. XII–328 Seiten. Tafeln und Karten inbegriffen. 2000.

BIBLISCHES INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG SCHWEIZ

Nachdem Sie das Diplom oder Lizentiat in Theologie, Bibelwissenschaft, Altertumskunde Palästinas/ Israels, Vorderasiatischer Archäologie oder einen gleichwertigen Leistungsausweis erworben haben, ermöglicht Ihnen ab Oktober 1997 ein Studienjahr (Oktober – Juni), am Biblischen Institut in Freiburg in der Schweiz ein

Spezialisierungszeugnis BIBEL UND ARCHÄOLOGIE

(Elemente der Feldarchäologie, Ikonographie, Epigraphik,
Religionsgeschichte Palästinas/Israels)

zu erwerben.

Das Studienjahr wird in Verbindung mit der Universität Bern (25 Min. Fahrzeit) organisiert. Es bietet Ihnen die Möglichkeit,

- ☞ eine Auswahl einschlägiger Vorlesungen, Seminare und Übungen im Bereich "Bibel und Archäologie" bei Walter Dietrich, Othmar Keel, Ernst Axel Knauf, Max Küchler, Silvia Schroer und Christoph Uehlinger zu belegen;
- ☞ diese Veranstaltungen durch solche in Ägyptologie (Hermann A. Schlögl, Freiburg), Vorderasiatischer Archäologie (Markus Wäfler, Bern) und altorientalischer Philologie (Pascal Attinger, Esther Flückiger, beide Bern) zu ergänzen;
- ☞ die einschlägigen Dokumentationen des Biblischen Instituts zur palästinisch-israelischen Miniaturkunst aus wissenschaftlichen Grabungen (Photos, Abdrücke, Kartei) und die zugehörigen Fachbibliotheken zu benutzen;
- ☞ mit den großen Sammlungen (über 10'000 Stück) von Originalen altorientalischer Miniaturkunst des Biblischen Instituts (Rollsiegel, Skarabäen und andere Stempelsiegel, Amulette, Terrakotten, palästinische Keramik, Münzen usw.) zu arbeiten und sich eine eigene Dokumentation (Abdrücke, Dias) anzulegen;
- ☞ während der Sommerferien an einer Ausgrabung in Palästina / Israel teilzunehmen, wobei die Möglichkeit besteht, mindestens das Flugticket vergütet zu bekommen.

Um das Spezialisierungszeugnis zu erhalten, müssen zwei benotete Jahrexamen abgelegt, zwei Seminarscheine erworben und eine schriftliche wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Umfange eines Zeitschriftenartikels verfaßt werden.

Interessenten und Interessentinnen wenden sich bitte an den Curator des Instituts:

PD Dr. Christoph Uehlinger
Biblisches Institut
Universität, Miséricorde
CH-1700 Freiburg / Schweiz
Fax +41 – (0)26 – 300 9754

INSTITUT BIBLIQUE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE FRIBOURG EN SUISSE

L'Institut biblique de l'Université de Fribourg en Suisse offre la possibilité d'acquérir un

certificat de spécialisation
**CRITIQUE TEXTUELLE ET HISTOIRE DU TEXTE
ET DE L'EXÉGÈSE DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT**

(Spezialisierungszeugnis Textkritik und Geschichte des Textes
und der Interpretation des Alten Testamentes)

en une année académique (octobre à juin). Toutes les personnes ayant obtenu une licence en théologie ou un grade académique équivalent peuvent en bénéficier.

Cette année d'études peut être organisée

- ☛ autour de la critique textuelle proprement dite (méthodes, histoire du texte, instruments de travail, édition critique de la Bible);
- ☛ autour des témoins principaux du texte biblique (texte masorétique et masore, textes bibliques de Qumran, Septante, traductions hexaplares, Vulgate, Targoums) et leurs langues (hébreu, araméen, grec, latin, syriaque, copte), enseignées en collaboration avec les chaires de patrologie et d'histoire ancienne, ou
- ☛ autour de l'histoire de l'exégèse juive (en hébreu et en judéo-arabe) et chrétienne (en collaboration avec la patrologie et l'histoire de l'Eglise).

L'Institut biblique dispose d'une bibliothèque spécialisée dans ces domaines. Les deux chercheurs de l'Institut biblique consacrés à ces travaux sont Adrian Schenker et Yohanan Goldman.

Pour l'obtention du certificat, deux examens annuels, deux séminaires et un travail écrit équivalent à un article sont requis. Les personnes intéressées peuvent obtenir des informations supplémentaires auprès du Curateur de l'Institut biblique:

Prof. Dr. Adrian Schenker
Institut Biblique
Université, Miséricorde
CH-1700 Fribourg / Suisse
Fax +41 - (0)26 - 300 9754

Summary

Since the end of the 19th century at least 16 different primary influences on the vision of Daniel 7:2-14 have been proposed, thereby demonstrating the complexity of its traditio-historical background. However, most traditio-historical reviews on the vision of Daniel 7 barely outline the parameters of the debate and usually concentrate either on the first (v. 2-8) or the second part (v. 9-14). The research history in this volume discusses in detail the various proposed influences on the whole vision. However, instead of presenting bare summaries of the different positions, footnotes will often contain substantive quotations of the original publications. They elucidate underlying concepts more accurately and function as windows into a sometimes heated ideological struggle. In addition, the reader is aided in forming his or her own judgement by means of critical scholarly remarks on the various proposals. The present study also provides an example for examining the mechanics of the traditio-historical method, as well as the difficulty of establishing a uniform measure for determining what constitutes a parallel.

Zusammenfassung

Seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts sind mindestens 16 unterschiedliche Haupteinflüsse auf die Vision von Daniel 7,2-14 ausfindig gemacht worden. Sie bezeugen die Komplexität des traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrundes dieser Vision. Verfügbare traditionsgeschichtliche Zusammenfassungen vermitteln meistens einen knappen Abriss der Diskussion und konzentrieren sich oft nur auf den ersten (Verse 2-8) oder den zweiten Teil (Verse 9-14) der Vision. Die vorliegende Forschungsgeschichte stellt detailliert die unterschiedlichen Positionen hinsichtlich des traditionsgeschichtlichen Einflusses auf die ganze Vision dar. Anstelle von lediglich knappen Zusammenfassungen bietet sie in den Fussnoten oft substantielle Zitate aus den Originalpublikationen. Diese dienen nicht nur der besseren Erklärung, sondern geben auch einen Einblick in eine manchmal hitzige ideologische Auseinandersetzung. Zusätzlich zu den Traditionen und Einflüssen, wie sie die verschiedenen Autoren selbst gesehen haben, wird dem/der LeserIn zur besseren Urteilsbildung am Schluss jedes Abschnittes eine Liste kritischer Entgegnungen bereitgestellt. Dieser Band soll aber nicht nur über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung informieren. Er stellt auch ein Hilfsmittel dar, die Funktionsweise der traditionsgeschichtlichen Methode zu studieren. Gleichzeitig wird die Schwierigkeit deutlich zu definieren, was eine Parallele darstellt.